DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 286 SO 009 730

AUTHOR Hine, Frances D.; And Others
TITLE The Aesthetic Eye Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 76
GRANT ES-22365-75-419
NOTE 76p.; For a related document, see SO 009 731

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aesthetic Education; *Art Appreciation; Art Education; Cultural Enrichment; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Humanities; *Pilot Projects; Program Content; *Program Descriptions; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Visual Literacy
IDENTIFIERS *Aesthetic Eye Project

ABSTRACT

This report describes the aesthetic education project, which embraces a conceptual structure, a perceptual approach to learning, and belief that aesthetics can be inculcated into the teaching-learning process. The project's goal was to develop an educational base and requisite expertise so that teachers can organize an aesthetic education curriculum. For its conceptual structure, the project implemented concepts, strategies, and evaluation based on the California State Art Education Framework. Fifty participants included elementary teachers, junior and senior high art teachers, principals, art consultants, a music specialist, a resource teacher, university professors, and community agency people. The project's program was organized around three phases over 18 months. Phase one was program planning and development of an aesthetic education seminar for teachers. Phase two was the six-week inservice teacher seminar that included discussion, laboratory work, curriculum development, and materials review. Phase three was classroom implementation of seminar outcomes for the 1975-76 school year. Evaluation techniques included the Aesthetic Eye Inventory, interviews, rating scales, monitoring reports, teacher logs, and experience descriptions. Also, a profile of participants was prepared for project evaluation. Findings revealed significant gains in participants' abilities to use the conceptual structure and perceptual techniques. It was determined that the structure does provide a basis for teaching children about art. (Author/ND)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED133286

FINAL REPORT
Grant No. ES-22365-75-419

National Endowment for the Humanities
Office of the Los Angeles County
Superintendent of Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE AESTHETIC EYE PROJECT

SP009730

Dr. Frances D. Hine, Project Director
Dr. Gilbert A. Clark
Dr. W. Dwaine Greer
Dr. Ronald H. Silverman

August, 1976

ABSTRACT

This project was based on an aesthetic education position - one that embraced a conceptual structure, a perceptual approach to learning and a belief in embedding this in a teaching-learning process.

The project goal was to develop an educational base and the requisite expertise which will enable teachers to develop aesthetic education curriculum with accompanying strategies and instructional materials for work with children in school and non-school situations.

Through defined objectives, this project implemented concepts, strategies and evaluation that had practical application in the teaching-learning situation as required by the California State Art Education Framework.

A total of fifty school and non-school participants representing elementary classroom teachers, junior and senior high school art teachers, principals, art consultants, a music specialist, a resource teacher, university professors and community agency people were involved. This group represented fifteen school districts, three universities, one parochial school in the Los Angeles Catholic Archdiocese, and nine community agencies in the Los Angeles County as well as one school district in San Bernardino County.

The project program was organized around three phases encompassing an eighteen month time span. Phase one was program planning and development of an aesthetic education seminar held during the summer, 1975. Phase two was a six-weeks in-service seminar designed to increase teacher knowledge of and competency in working with aesthetic education. Activities included discussions with consultants, visitations to museums, galleries and community centers, laboratory experiences, development of curriculum, and review of instructional materials. Phase three was classroom implementation of seminar outcomes by participants scheduled from October 1975 through May 1976. Activities involved testing individual approaches in the classroom or in other learning situations, developing informal assessment of approaches, and use of this information to modify and/or extend pupil experiences. Five workshops were scheduled during the year to assist teachers with implementation. Additional assistance was provided through on-site visitation. Evaluation techniques included: The Aesthetic Eye Inventory, interviews, rating scales, monitoring reports, teacher logs, and "peak experience' descriptions. In addition, an Aesthetic Eye participants profile was prepared as an aid to overall project evaluation.

The findings revealed significant gains in participants' ability to use the property systems and aesthetic perception technique in encounters with serious and popular works of art. Participants learned to describe aesthetic experience more objectively and specifically. They acquired arguments in support of aesthetic education that were embedded in the process of learning to use the aesthetic perception technique. Given training and practice, school and community agency personnel can plan and implement aesthetic education programs based on an aesthetic perception approach. While there will be variations in interpretation, the structure when adopted, does provide a basis for work with children that can be used with confidence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

LIST OF TABLES ii

Figure 1 8
Figure 2 13

CHAPTER I, CONFRONTING THE PROBLEM 1

What Gave Rise to the Project?
The Proposal as a Response to the Problem Conditions
The Educational Approach of This Project

CHAPTER II, PROJECT DESCRIPTION 5

The Selection of Participants
A Description of Participants
A Description of Implementation Sites
Project Description and Activities
Phase I, Planning Session
Phase II, Summer Seminar
Phase III, Classroom Implementation
Approaches to Evaluation
The Evaluation Plan
Dissemination of Project Results
Dissemination Objective

CHAPTER III, IMPLEMENTATION AND ASSESSMENT 20

Phase I, Planning Session
Phase II, Summer Seminar
Activity Description and Assessment
Activities and Assessment Related to Objectives One and Two
Seminar Activities
Attendance
"Three Times a Day" Aesthetics
Reactions of Participants
Resource Materials
The Aesthetic Eye Inventory
Activities and Assessment Related to Objectives Three and Four
Activities and Assessment Relating to Objective Five
Phase III, Classroom Implementation
Visitation Records
Instructional Materials and Their Use
Teachers' Logs
Reporting Peak Experiences and Use of Property Systems

Page

CHAPTER III, IMPLEMENTATION AND ASSESSMENT, continued

Participant Workshop Attendance
Workshop Assessment
The Project Assessment Form
Participation in Pilot Centers

CHAPTER IV, SUMMARY OF RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS. 51

Phase I, Planning Session
Conclusions
Implications
Phase II, Summer Seminar
Summary of Results: Objective One
Conclusions: Objective One
Implications: Objective One
Summary of Results: Objective Two
Conclusions: Objective Two
Implications: Objective Two
Summary of Results: Objective Three
Conclusions: Objective Three
Implications: Objective Three
Summary of Results: Objective Four
Conclusions: Objective Four
Implications: Objective Four
Summary of Results: Objective Five
Conclusions: Objective Five
Implications: Objective Five
Phase III, Classroom Implementation
Summary of Results: Objective One
Conclusions: Objective One
Implications: Objective One
Summary of Results: Objective Two
Conclusions: Objective Two
Implications: Objective Two
Aesthetic Eye Participant Profile
Summary of Results: Participant Profile
Conclusions: Participant Profile
Implications: Participant Profile

APPENDICES . . . . . Vol. Two

Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C
Appendix D

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Aesthetic Eye Project report describes an approach and summarizes work with a group of school and non-school people on aesthetic education. The study developed from recognized needs of children and the inspiration and scholarship of Professor Harry S. Broudy. The National Endowment for the Humanities and the Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools provided grant funding support.

Through efforts of participants, a beginning commitment to teachers and children was realized. Their inquiry into the conceptual structure and aesthetic perceptual approach, their need for practical translations of aesthetic perception concepts and a willingness to experiment in a variety of teaching-learning situations gave the study richness and vitality.

The following school districts, universities, and community agencies contributed support through their cooperation and encouragement to participants:

ABC Unified
Alhambra City
Arcadia Unified
Compton Unified
Centinela Valley Union
El Monte City
La Canada Unified
Lawndale
Little Lake City
Los Angeles Unified
Los Nietos
Montebello Unified
Pasadena Unified
Rowland Unified
Santa Monica Unified

California State University at Los Angeles
California State University at Northridge
Loyola Marymount University
Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Los Angeles City Municipal Art Gallery
Barnsdall Junior Art Center
Rio Hondo Area Volunteer Center
Self Help Graphics
Arts in Action
Downey Museum of Art
Los Angeles County Parks and Recreation
Watts Towers Art Center
Los Angeles Catholic Archdiocese
Yucaipa School District, San Bernardino County

Appreciation for assistance in programming and computer applications is expressed to Earl Owens and Tony Corona, Division of Program Evaluation, Research and Pupil Services, Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools.

The Project Staff
August 1975

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table One:	Categories, Numbers and Percent of School and Non-school Participants	6
Table Two:	Frequency of Seminar Activities	22
Table Three:	Participants' Attendance Record at Seminar Sessions	23
Table Four:	Participants' Mean Ratings of Summer Seminar Activities	24
Table Five:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question One	29
Table Six:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Two	29
Table Seven:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Three	30
Table Eight:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Four	31
Table Nine:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Five	31
Table Ten:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Six	32
Table Eleven:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Seven	32
Table Twelve:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Eight	33
Table Thirteen:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Nine	33
Table Fourteen:	Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test, Question Ten	34
Table Fifteen:	Components and Percentages of Their Occurance in Curriculum Plans	36
Table Sixteen:	Summary of Monitor Ratings on a Five Point Scale (5.00) of Visitations to Teaching-Learning Situations	37

		Page
Table Seventeen:	Components and Percentages of Their Occurance in Curriculum Plans	40
Table Eighteen:	Participants' Attendance Record, Five Workshop Sessions	44
Table Nineteen:	Participants' Assessment of Workshop November 14, 1976	44
Table Twenty:	Participants' Assessment of Five Workshop Sessions	45
Table Twenty-one:	Results of Six Judges Ratings on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Pretest, Question Six, One Word Responses to a Painting by Forty-five Participants	Appendix B
Table Twenty-two:	Summary of Collectables Assessment	Appendix C
Table Twenty-three:	Aesthetic Eye Participants' Profile	Appendix D
Figure 1		Page 8
Figure 2		Page 13

CHAPTER I

CONFRONTING THE PROBLEM

The Aesthetic Eye Project is based on an aesthetic education position -- one that embraces a conceptual structure, a perceptual approach to learning, and a belief in embedding this in a teaching-learning process. The position grew out of discussions with Professor Harry S. Broudy who formulated a theory and an approach for working with the learner.

This project, as an experiment, was intended to translate Broudy's broadly conceived position into applications that would help teachers become more competent in the area of aesthetic education. And, from this experience, the natural extension for teachers would be to carry on an experiment with children.

The goal of the project is to develop an operational structure and the requisite expertise which will enable teachers to develop an aesthetic education curriculum with accompanying strategies and instructional materials for work with children in school and non-school situations.

What Gave Rise to the Project?

The need for this project emerged from problems and issues related to current educational developments. The Los Angeles County Art Education Council, composed of art education professionals representing institutions serving the 1,005,389 students in Los Angeles County, grew concerned that the fostering of aesthetic education in the schools was being neglected.

While there was rhetoric that supported the teaching of aesthetic judgment included in official publications of the State Department of Education, there was little help available for the classroom teacher faced with teaching children this difficult area.

There are available few suggested concepts or structures for the development of aesthetic judgment or any of the other components to serve as curriculum content for achieving learning outcomes. The usual approach tends to assume that school districts have art consultant expertise to assist teachers with this dimension of curriculum development. Yet, current personnel reports reveal that only fourteen out of eighty-two school districts in this county have art consultants. While seventy-one school districts within this county have identified district-level contact persons for art programs, seventy-six percent of these people represent district administrative staff. Only one percent represents a classroom teacher. This obvious lack of adequate help for teachers working with aesthetic judgment appears to mitigate adequate development of aesthetic judgment in the classroom.

In addition, the subject area itself remains a problem. Content and its organization, strategies for instruction in aesthetic judgment and choices among premises are elusive and controversial among educators. Although some research has been done on children's preferences in various art media, especially in music and the visual arts, much less has been learned about the formation of standards for such preferences. The tendency in both institutions of education and children's museum programs has been to treat aesthetic judgment under the traditional rubric of appreciation. Enjoyment, knowledge about the artist and the historical styles and settings in which works of art were produced are elements often stressed in such instructional programs. Such knowledge is eminently worth teaching, but it often results in pupils feeling obliged to adopt uncritically conventional standards. Whether or not they discern the qualities that have earned recognized works critical approval remains problematic.

Because these conditions exist, the Los Angeles County Art Education Council jointly sponsored with the California Art Education Association two meetings in May 1974 with Dr. Harry S. Broudy in which aesthetic judgment was discussed under the broad concept of aesthetic education. As a result of these discussions, the Council recommended that a proposal be developed to allow for indepth study and experimentation with aesthetic education and its relationship to aesthetic judgment.

The Proposal as a Response to the Problem Conditions

With the difficulties of selecting a stance from which to develop a program, the project chose to take Dr. Broudy's work as a starting point for the program which was to follow.

The starting point for the definition that was to emerge as the focus of the techniques learned during the summer seminar and activities of the project program was a distinction between preference and judgment. While many programs seemed to take enjoyment itself as the sole standard of aesthetic judgment, the project sought to establish a clear difference between liking a work of art and giving reasons for judging it to be good art. The goal in teaching for aesthetic judgment was to be authenticity combined with objectivity. By helping the pupil to perceive art objects, or any object for that matter, as an artist does, a necessary (albeit not a sufficient) preliminary for authentic-objective judgment is provided. The perception is the pupil's own and therefore authentic, but the norm by which it is judged is a mode of perception distinctive of those who create works of art. The proposed design was adopted as one that can be taught to and learned by the normal range of pupils.

The Educational Approach of This Project

The major organizing concept for the project was aesthetic education as defined by Broudy. He views aesthetic education as the development and refinement of aesthetic perception. Briefly stated, the process consists of helping the pupil respond to the appearance of objects in a given medium in terms of its:

a. Sensory properties (tones, colors, textures, etc.)
b. Formal properties (as involved in composition, design)
c. technical properties (modes of production peculiar to a given medium)
d. Expressive properties (properties by virtue of which the object conveys human import via an image or patterns of images. Expressive properties range from such qualities as sharp, flowing, rough, to cheerful, tense, strong, restless, to sad, gay, serene, to noble, sublime, awesome, regal, etc.)

Emphasis on early stages of instruction is on properties a, b, and c. Class d is highly subjective, yet if careful attention is paid to a, b, and c, there is less chance of using the object as a trigger to ideosyncratic interpretation or to fanciful projection of inner states to the work of art.

In other words, the process tries to be true to the way painters, composers, poets organize their materials to produce objects that convey human import by means of images. It was helpful therefore, to have working artists demonstrate their methods of work. Experimental work done by Broudy and some of his students had indicated that the "skills of impression" or of artistic perception can be taught to persons who have no special talent for artistic production. Some opportunity for experimenting with various media has also been found helpful in the teaching of perception.

Perception of itself is not taken as equivalent to aesthetic judgment, although it is a necessary prerequisite for authentic judgment. For an informed critical judgment one must undertake some study of style, history of art, and the literature of criticism. This can be done with teachers, although it requires considerable time. The idea would be to introduce the program participants to the dimensions of aesthetic judgment, and provide what practice time would allow.

As one way of doing this, critical essays of particular works of art would be compared with those works to see whether the critic's analysis in terms of the

four types of aesthetic properties discussed above can be discerned and accepted by the student. Some practice would be given in writing alternative critiques.

Underlying this approach to aesthetic education is the belief that its primary goal is to improve the student's ability to perceive works of the imagination and that this is a mode of experience that can be distinguished from intellectual and practical activity. "Perception," according to Broudy, "is a kind of knowing, but it is not identical with scientific knowing. It is emotional but emotion recalled in tranquility, it is meaning but meaning presented in an image." "...all aesthetic experiences involve perceiving a metaphor or analogy, i.e., a non-literal communication of significance."

If D. W. Gotschalk's characterization of the aesthetic object as one "interesting to perceive" is apt, then teaching for aesthetic judgment comes to understanding what makes an object interesting to perceive imagination or imaginative perception.

CHAPTER II

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This chapter reports on the variety of personnel involved, presents a description of the program and of plans developed to assess various dimensions of participation.

The Selection of Participants

One of the primary tasks of the Los Angeles County Art Education Council, the group which initiated the Aesthetic Eye Program, was to aid in identifying personnel who should be invited to participate in this venture. It was decided by the Council that the experimental nature of the proposed program required involvement of personnel who had demonstrated expertise and who would, therefore, be in position to focus their attention on applying insights and utilizing materials which the program was to offer.

A letter was sent to those recommended to ascertain the level of interest (see Appendix A). School districts and community agencies were contacted. Several names were submitted for participation and the selection of participants was made utilizing the following criteria.

a. Worked with a group of children, youth or adults over a sustained period of time.

b. Expressed willingness to develop a curriculum plan during the seminar for use in teaching-learning situations.

c. Expressed willingness to institute and evaluate a curriculum plan during the school year 1975-76.

d. Written commitment by participant's employer (school district), institution or agency to participate in implementation activities during the school year 1975-76.

A roster of names was put together of those who could attend the orienting seminar which was rescheduled from July 21 to August 28, 1975. The groups were selected to represent a cross-section of schools, museums, and community agency personnel which is somewhat unique in the annals of inservice education.

A Description of Participants

A total of fifty participants were involved in the project and are representative of fifteen school districts, three universities, one parochial school in the Los Angeles Catholic Archdiocese, nine community agencies in Los Angeles County and one school district in San Bernardino County.

Table One

Categories, Numbers and Percent of School and Non-School Participants

Participant	Grade Level or Program	Number	Percent
Public school personnel:			
classroom teacher	Kindergarten through third grade	12	24
classroom teacher	Grade four through six	6	12
art teacher	Grade seven through eight	5	10
art teacher	Grade nine through twelve	8	16
music specialist		1	2
resource teacher		1	2
art consultant		2	4
elementary school principal		2	4
Total		37	74%
College and University			
Art Education faculty	Teacher Education	3	6
Total		3	6%
Museum Docent	Los Angeles County Museum of Art	2	4
	Los Angeles City Municipal Art Gallery	1	2
Total		3	6%
Community Agencies			
Rio Hondo Area Volunteer Center		1	2
Self Help Graphics		1	2
Arts in Action		1	2
Barnsdall Junior Arts Center		1	2
South El Monte Craft Center		1	2
Watts Towers Art Center		1	2
Downey Museum of Art		1	2
Total		7	14%
	TOTAL	50	100%

Participants differed greatly in their professional backgrounds, in the arts in general and the visual arts in particular. They ranged from classroom teachers who had one or two courses in the arts, art teachers with master degrees in art, to a professor with a doctorate in art education.

The museum docents and community agency groups reflected some variation in educational background in art but had considerable expertise in this area. For example, one was an administrator-nun who was sponsored by her order to establish and maintain an artist run workshop for all age groups within the Mexican-American barrio of East Los Angeles. Another administered a community oriented program called "Arts in Action." Another was a nationally known sculptor who has become director of the Watts Towers Art Center.

Whatever their institutional affiliation or grade level assignment, participants did appear to have some things in common: an interest in or curiosity about dealing with the problems of developing the aesthetic sensibilities of their students and a commitment from their respective agencies supporting their participation. This commitment included support by educational institutions through provision of release time so that participants could attend five workshop sessions held during the 1975-76 school year (note these sessions in Figure 1).

As can be inferred from the above listing, the personnel who were to be involved in the Aesthetic Eye program were indeed a diverse group, ranging widely in terms of both background and vocational responsibilities. This range of participation proved most effective and efficient in light of identified needs and new concepts of community involvement in teaching-learning situations.

A Description of Implementation Sites

Descriptions provided by the school personnel who work consistently with the same group of children over a specific period of time indicates that four thousand children and youth were involved in study programs at the classroom level. The ethnic representation is broad with roughly fifty percent of the school population Mexican-American as designated by Spanish surname, twenty percent blacks, twenty percent anglos and ten percent orientals. The socio-economic levels of these groups estimated from teacher information indicates a range from low to upper middle class groupings. In the lower class group, a number of children are in the Aid to Dependent Children classification.

Accurate population data from museum docents or community agency participants were not available because they work with groups of varying sizes over brief periods of time. They did, however, work directly with children or with adults in training programs from all parts of the city and county.

Project Description and Activities

One intent of this project was to implement the development of consistent programs of aesthetic education in Los Angeles County.

The program was organized around three phases encompassing a fifteen-month time span. Figure 1 presents a chart of this program. Phase I was program planning and development of an aesthetic education seminar held during the summer, 1975. Phase II was a six-weeks inservice seminar designed to increase teacher knowledge of and competency in working with aesthetic education. Phase III was classroom implementation of seminar outcomes by participants scheduled from October 1975 through May 1976.

Figure 1

PHASE I
Three Day
Planning Session
June 10-12, 1975

Structuring six week seminar, selecting topics, consultants, evaluation strategies.

PHASE II
Six Week
Summer Seminar
July 21 - August 28, 1975

Week 1
General orientation.
Written pre-test.

Week 2
Harry S. Broudy
Presentations/discussions.
Participant artist resource.
Small group activities.

Week 3
Harry S. Broudy
Presentations/discussions.
Participant artist resource.
Small group activities.

Harry S. Broudy: developing basic insights, fundamental considerations.

Week 4
Consultant presentatins and discussion.
Job alike groups.

Week 5
Consultant presentations and discussions, small group activities.

Week 6
Consultant presentations.
Written post-test.
Total and small group discussions.

PHASE III
Implementing
Aesthetic Eye Program
September 1975 - June 1976
Five
Workshop Sessions
Reviewing - Orienting

Workshop 1 - October 10, 1975
Total group and job-alike discussions.

Workshop 2 - November 14, 1975
Sharing experimental activities.
Selecting instructional material.

Workshop 3 - January 8-9, 1976
Harry S. Broudy
Presentations/discussions.
Participant sharing experimentation.

Workshop 4 - March 12, 1976
Developing strategies for using instructional materials, sharing experimentation

Workshop 5 - May 14, 1976
Sharing experimentation, planning for ongoing implementation.

Utilizing concepts and materials within elementary and secondary schools.

Applying concepts to museum education programs.

Integrating concepts and media within community agency programs.

Dissemination of Findings and Materials of Program

Collection of major idea papers.

Teacher-to-teacher curriculum approaches.

Model of in-service program

Final report for NEH/Field.

Informing the field through visual-oral-written presentations about the procedures and findings of program.

PHASE I, PLANNING SESSION

The planning committee was a group of school and non-school people. An initial premise in formulating this project was that aesthetic education was not the sole perogative or responsibility of school people. Many community agencies have taken responsibilities for establishing arts programs for children and are concerned about strengthening aesthetic education concepts in their programs. By combining efforts of these groups, it was felt that a more effective approach could be established.

Operating from this premise, the following criteria for participation and categories for representation were established. Planning committee members:

a. must currently be working with pupils and/or teachers at elementary, secondary, college or university levels, or in community agencies.

b. evidence genuine commitment to this project through willingness to study preparatory materials in aesthetic education and assume participation responsibilities.

c. willingness to arrange necessary time schedule for participation in planning.

The planning committee consisted of the following representative groups:

two Los Angeles County Art Education Council members
a member of a local university art education department
a general elementary classroom teacher
a secondary art teacher
a member of a non-school community agency
the project director, Office of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools
two seminar staff members

Dr. Harry S. Broudy, major consultant, met with the planning committee on three consecutive days. The objectives of the planning session were:

a. to plan specific content for a six-weeks summer seminar that would enable participants to increase teacher competency in working with aesthetic education.

b. to make recommendations for the organization of the seminar.

To accomplish the obove objectives, the planning committee did the following:

a. reviewed specified objectives and identified requisite course content, strategies, and time schedules for accomplishing objectives during a six-weeks (90 hours) period of study.

b. made recommendations regarding the selection of seminar personnel.

c. suggested methods for periodic assessment of participants' progress in seminar situations.

d. reviewed and made recommendations regarding a time schedule for disseminating seminar information.

PHASE II, SUMMER SEMINAR

A six-weeks summer seminar was conducted with fifty participants. It began on Monday, July 21, 1975 and concluded on Thursday, August 28, 1975. Participants attended sessions for three hours a day, five days per week.

The seminar was staffed by three staff members, the project director and consultants. Consultants were selected from four content areas: (1) aesthetic education, (2) studio and performing arts, art, (3) curriculum development and (4) evaluation.

While the central focus was on aesthetic education, some applications were made to other representative disciplines in the humanities to help participants broaden and extend their knowledge of aesthetics.

The participants worked mainly with the aesthetic education consultant and staff members. Discussions with artists, other professionals, and a curriculum consultant were on a short-term basis, a day or two, depending upon group needs.

The seminar was organized around four major objectives. They are presented here in two groups with their related activities. It was understood that these would not be treated as independent units in program development. Rather, they would be integrated in classroom strategies and instructional materials for practical application with learners.

Seminar Objectives - one and two:

(1) To develop knowledge about the nature and unique characteristics of aesthetic perception and judgment.

(2) To make application of knowledge about aesthetic perception with serious and popular works of art in formal and informal environments.

Seminar activities - participants were actively engaged in the following:

a. discussions with aesthetic education consultants to develop knowledge, clarify terminology and identify key concepts related to aesthetic education.

b. reading selective writing on aesthetic education and related fields.

c. visits to museums, galleries and community centers with aesthetic education consultant, staff and/or independent study.

d. talks with artists in studio situations to gain some understanding of the artists' aesthetic perspective.

e. talks with collectors and other professionals, a jazz musician, for example.

f. making written critiques from independent study of serious and popular works of art.

g. experimenting with selected art media in a non-technical way.

h. reviewing and using films, art reproductions, colored slides, photographs of art objects and other media.

Seminar Objectives - three and four

(3) To develop curriculum instructional materials and strategies that can be tested with pupils in various learning situations.

(4) To explore and develop some methods of assessing the attainment of aesthetic perception and judgment.

Seminar activities - participants were actively involved in the following:

a. formulating a group of objectives and concepts appropriate to particular age levels to be used as structure for aesthetic education curriculum.

b. identifying specific strategies for helping students acquire knowledge related to aesthetic perception and judgment using the four aesthetic properties framework.

c. organizing objectives, concepts and strategies to initiate and develop a consistent program of instruction.

d. reviewing and selecting visitation situations for pupil interaction with serious and popular works of art.

e. examining, selecting and developing instructional materials to use in clarifying and extending learners' aesthetic understandings.

f. identifying and developing techniques for assessing pupil progress.

PHASE III, CLASSROOM IMPLEMENTATION

Each seminar participant developed an aesthetic education curriculum plan for use with students in their teaching-learning situation. Implementation was considered a process of making careful observations of pupils' responses to the learning situation, assessing the quality of achievement, and using this information to develop curriculum alternatives that modified and/or extended pupil experiences. This project phase was designed to support this kind of experimental approach and offer guidance in implementing each participant's curriculum. Materials were purchased and organized for presentation to children and each participant went away with a proposal for work to be carried out during the school year.

The project director and a part-time consultant, who participated in the seminar, visited the various sites during the year. They assisted teachers in making applications in terms of their individual teaching styles and observed the implementation of a participant's curricula.

In addition, five full day workshops were held during the year on regular teaching days. The content and processes for these workshops were organized to help teachers (1) extend students' levels of learning aesthetic education concepts, (2) share and examine curriculum materials, teaching experiences and assessment processes and (3) provide experiences that would increase teacher knowledge of and competency in aesthetic education.

Implementation objectives:

a. To assist participants in utilizing newly acquired concepts and evaluate the effectiveness of project based curriculum and instructional strategies in various learning situations.

b. To conduct five inservice workshops to extend the development of aesthetic education curriculum, instructional strategies and materials and assessment.

Approaches to Evaluation

The approach to assessment was both formal and experimental. It was designed to study the abilities of participants and students to internalize and use aesthetic properties in perceiving and judging serious and popular works of art. It focused upon the development of techniques that would be used with seminar participants and also serve as models for use with children. The evaluation criteria were the project objectives and processes involving the four types of aesthetic properties. These approaches and their relationships to the existing and implementing phases of the project are presented in graphic form in Figure 2 and the specific plan is outlined.

Figure 2

	Six Week Orienting Seminar	
Written pre and post test assessing participants' ability to employ aesthetic perception and criticism.	July 21 - August 28, 1975	At end of seminar and after eight months of implementation, ascertaining reactions of participants to major elements of program.
Daily log of activities; drawing inferrences about increasing levels of statements and questions made by participants.	Periodically interviewing a random sampling of participants to ascertain current reactions to seminar proceedings.	Unobtrusive measures: examining records of attendance and the extent to which available materials have been utilized; analysis of "peak experience" statements, and interest in serving a pilot center.
	Implementing Aesthetic Eye Program September 1975 - June 1976	
Visitations to sites by project staff to assess how and to what extent aesthetic concepts and media are utilized.		Assessment by participants of their own programs using a variety of measurement techniques i.e., pre-post testing and content analysis of pupil responses.

The Evaluation Plan

Objective	Assessment Process	Criterion Measure
PHASE I, PLANNING		
To plan specific content for a six-weeks summer seminar that will enable participants to increase teacher competency in working with aesthetic education.	The committee, consultant and project staff developed a plan for the summer seminar.	A report was prepared that delineated the summer seminar plan and summarized recommendations.
To make recommendations for the organization of the seminar.		A schedule was developed which specifies the consultants, content areas and activities.
PHASE II, SUMMER SEMINAR		
To develop knowledge about the nature and unique characteristics of aesthetic perception and judgment.	The Aesthetic Eye Inventory was administered on a pre and post basis (first and last week) to all seminar participants.	An Aesthetic Eye Inventory, a locally constructed measure consisting of five written responses defining aspects of aesthetic education (part one) and five written responses to five different art forms (part two). In part one, the individual was asked to define key concepts as indicies of the extent of aesthetic perception training knowledge. The specification for this part of the measure was that the individual would evidence an increased frequency of aesthetic concept labels and the relationships among them.

Objective	Assessment Process	Criterion Measure
To make application of knowledge about aesthetic perception with serious and popular works of art in formal and informal environments.		In part two, the individual made single word and other written responses to different art images projected for a three minute exposure on a screen. The specification for this part of the measure was that the individual would move from subjective, ambiguous responses to objective, specific responses and would extend the range and number of aesthetic categories and the relationships among them. Mean gain scores were calculated for the group.
	A random sample of fifteen participants who received instruction were interviewed during the second and fifth week of the seminar.	Interview protocols were developed and used with participants to assess effectiveness in achieving seminar objectives.
	A Seminar Assessment Form was administered to all participants on the last meeting day.	The Seminar Assessment Form, a locally developed five point rating scale, was employed to assess six components of the seminar: (1) consultants' presentations, (2) Dr. Broudy's presentations and discussions, (3) other total group activities, (4) small group activities, (5) auxiliary activities and (6) organization. The specification for this measure was that over 60% of participants' ratings on these six categories would be above a mean of 3.0. The total seminar activities mean rating would also be above 3.0. A section for reporting comments was summarized.

Objective	Assessment Process	Criterion Measure
	A Post Seminar Assessment Form was administered to all participants during the final May workshop.	The Post Seminar Assessment Form was used to ascertain the participant's assessment of the six weeks experience after working for eight months in the teaching-learning situation. A summary of these responses was made.
To develop curriculum instructional materials and strategies that can be tested with pupils in various learning situations.	A curriculum plan was developed by each of the fifty seminar participants. All plans will be examined by project staff.	Each curriculum plan was (1) developed for specific age level(s), (2) utilized aesthetic properties as content, process and teaching strategies and (3) contains an informal technique for assessing achievement of objectives. Each document was examined utilizing a specified criteria.
To explore and develop some methods of assessing the attainment of aesthetic perception and judgment.	Participants developed informal instruments to measure the acheivement of curriculum objectives.	Informal instruments were critiqued by project staff, using criteria of teacher designated success in achieving objective.
To record the progress of this project as an example of inquiry into aesthetic education.	During the seminar the staff maintained a log to document (a) daily activities, (b) procedural modifications and changes and (c) weaknesses and strengths in program development.	The log and other products such as slides and tape recordings, products produced by participants, and summary reports were organized as documentation.
	Data collections were made of visual and audio records and participants' products.	Visual and audio records and participants' products were organized for use as dissemination information.

Objective	Assessment Process	Criterion Measure
PHASE III, CLASSROOM IMPLEMENTATION		
To assist participants in utilizing newly acquired concepts and evaluate the effectiveness of project based curriculum and instructional strategies in various learning situations.	Visitation Report Form was used by the project director and consultant to monitor classroom implementation.	The Visitation Report Form, a locally developed rating scale, was used to assess (1) display of aesthetic objects in physical environment, (2) evidence of development of property system and (3) evaluation of pupil growth. The specification for this measure was that over 60% of participants' ratings of these three areas would be above a mean of 3.0.
	A "Peak Experience" Form was completed by each of the fifty seminar participants.	The "Peak Experience" Form, a locally developed instrument, was used as a means of collecting information on an activity that the participant perceived as highly successful in furthering his/her objectives in working with children. A summary of this documentation was made.
	A Project Assessment Form was completed by each of the fifty seminar participants.	The Project Assessment Form, a locally developed instrument was employed to collect data on (1) summer seminar described in Phase II, (2) workshop meetings during the year, (3) implementation in the classroom or other learning situations, (4) effects beyond implementation and (5) individual plans for continuing work on aesthetic education.

Objective	Assessment Process	Criterion Measure
To conduct five inservice workshops to extend the development of aesthetic education curriculum, instructional strategies, and materials and assessment.	The project director monitored inservice sessions conducted for participants. Those attending signed a register. A Workshop Assessment Form was administered to all participants during the final workshop meeting.	Records on the attendance of inservice sessions were maintained as documentation. The Workshop Assessment Form, a locally developed five point rating scale, was used to assess the various activities that were included during five workshop sessions. The specification for this measure was that over 60% of participants' ratings would be above a mean of 3.0. The total seminar activities mean rating would also be above 3.0.

Dissemination of Project Results

Dissemination was viewed as an essential means for sharing information, procedures and findings that could be used to provide classroom teachers with some practical examples of possible approaches to aesthetic education and to assist those who have responsibilities for establishing inservice education programs.

Dissemination Objective

(5) To record the progress of this project as an example of inquiry into aesthetic education.

Dissemination activities - project staff were actively involved in the following:

a. Maintained a log to document (1) daily activities, (2) procedural modifications and changes and (3) weaknesses and strengths in program development.

b. Summarized and reported participants' evaluations of the effectiveness of project activities.

c. Utilized media such as slides and tape recordings for visual documentation.

d. Collected examples of participants' products developed in the seminar.

CHAPTER III

IMPLEMENTATION AND ASSESSMENT

This project was organized into planning, seminar, and implementation phases. Program content, a developmental sequence of events, and time schedules for working with participants were delineated for each phase. The following discussion of implementation and assessment is reported in relation to each of these phases.

PHASE I, PLANNING SESSION

The planning session was organized as a committee of nine with Dr. Harry S. Broudy serving as consultant. Its major responsibility was to achieve the following objectives:

a. to plan specific content for a six-weeks summer seminar that would enable participants to increase teacher competency in working with aesthetic education.

b. to make recommendations for the organization of the seminar.

In the initial planning committee discussion of project goal and objectives, a decision was made that shaped the plan of this project. It was recommended that the study of Dr. Broudy's conceptual framework and perceptual approach center upon visual arts rather than all the arts, i.e., music, dance, drama and literature. It was also agreed that some presentations and demonstrations be made from other arts to illustrate other applications of this framework and approach. The rationale for this decision was that the project was experimental. It seemed advisable to set this limitation to facilitate the study of the inservice approach and assessment with participants.

As discussions proceeded, six general guidelines were developed that sharpened the focus of the group and suggested working procedures. These guidelines included:

a. provide opportunities for participants to learn to perceive in the mode of the artist.

b. develop terminology so participants could articulate aesthetic education concepts.

c. use diverse media, i.e., works of art, slides, films and the environment as instructional material to illustrate ideas and practice working with the conceptual framework.

d. work with the impact of the popular arts in people's preference, choice making and judgment as a means of illustrating how aesthetic cues are used to exert influence.

e. work with the concept of form since it is highly significant to the artist and is a difficult concept for some people to understand.

f. involve participants in activities that enable them to learn from direct experience.

These guidelines gave the committee direction for thinking specifically about the selection of seminar activities and lead to the development of two documents. A Seminar Content Form listed the project goal, suggested activities, consultants, selected resources, possible ways to organize the seminar, and potential approaches to evaluation (see Appendix A). A second document was the actual sequencing and scheduling of instructional content, consultant presentations, events, and assessment which, with some modification, became the general work plan for the seminar (see Appendix B).

With the development of specific objectives and the seminar plan established, the project staff undertook the problem of planning learning outcomes assessment. Two additional techniques were adapted with reference to the evaluation plan in the project proposal. These were an Aesthetic Eye Inventory (a pre and post test consisting of ten questions) and a series of questions to be used during interviews with a random sample of participants. A more detailed description of these instruments is presented in the discussion of Phase II.

Such details as the location of the seminar, arranging for university course credit, and establishing a small library of papers, journals, and books were responsibilities assumed by the project staff.

PHASE II, THE SUMMER SEMINAR

Activity Description and Assessment

The six weeks summer seminar was organized around four inter-related objectives. The following discussion of seminar activities and assessment is organized into two parts. The first part deals with objectives one and two, the development and application of knowledge. The second part deals with objectives three and four, the implementation of aesthetic education concepts in learning situations.

Activities and Assessment Related to Objectives One and Two

Objectives one and two deal with the development and application of knowledge and are stated as follows:

(1) To develop knowledge about the nature and unique characteristics of aesthetic perception and judgment.

(2) To make application of knowledge about aesthetic perception with serious and popular works of art in formal and informal environments.

The seminar opened with introductions, discussion of the goal and objectives, and the scheduled plan for study was distributed to each participant. Responsibilities outlined in the initial participation agreement were reviewed for clarification and discussion. Participants were also oriented to various facilities and procedural details related to attendance, use of the library and registration for six units of credit with California State University at Los Angeles. Thirty-six participants registered for course credit.

During this first meeting, the Aesthetic Eye Inventory was administered to participants. This test was closely referenced to the theoretical position underlying the program instruction. It consisted of ten questions (see Appendix B). This test was administered on the final day of the seminar. Results of this pre and post assessment are reported on pages 29 through 34.

Seminar Activities

The seminar activities included a variety of consultant and staff presentations and total and small group activities. Each day's activity was reported in the daily log. The frequency of these activities is presented in Table Two.

Table Two

Frequency of Seminar Activities

Seminar Activity	Frequency
Consultant Presentations	
Conceptual framework and perceptual approach	12
Aesthetics in relation to the dance, found objects, environment, TV commercials, poetry, and jazz	6
Project Staff Presentations	
Historical review of art education	1
Kits and Caboodles (individualized instructional materials)	1
Evaluation in aesthetic education	1
Survey of works of art from various cultures and analysis of selected works	1
Administration and Aesthetic Education (panel)	1
Other Total Group Activities	
Video tape of a children's dance program	1
Watts Towers and artist studio visitation	1
Practice in analysis of art works by aesthetic properties	4
Individual participants demonstration of analysis of a work of art	3
Sharing resource materials	5
Demonstration of improvisational tour by participant, Los Angeles County Museum of Art	1
Artist participants discussing their own works of art	5
Review discussion of group experience	6
Developing criteria for the selection of instructional materials for aesthetic education	1
Commercial exhibit of instructional materials for aesthetic education	1
Three Times a Day Aesthetics	6
Discussion of proposed school/museum project, Downey Museum	1
Small Group Activities	
Practice in analysis of works of art	6
Developing plans for 1975-76 in job alike groups	2
Discussion of questions	1

Attendance

Attendance during the 29 sessions was relatively stable for a summer seminar. The attendance mean for the total group was 28 sessions. Table Three presents the percentage of participants in attendance and the number of sessions.

Table Three

Participants' Attendance Record at Seminar Sessions

Percent	Number of sessions
42	29
30	28
10	27
4	26
6	25
4	24
4	23

"Three Times a Day" Aesthetics

In planning the seminar, the committee recommended that the break period on each Friday be designated as an experiment in the practical application of aesthetics to the selection and arrangement of food. Two members of the planning committee, who were also participants in the seminar, volunteered to prepare the first Friday event. The element of surprise was a prt of the event. Seminar participants were not informed of the details other than to observe an item titled "3x A Day" listed on the Friday schedule.

The first event involved a sensory experience with all types of natural foods, i.e., raisins, nuts, seeds, along with a variety of very small crackers. Each type of food was in paper bag containers arranged on a large table. Participants were very enthused in their responses and many comments were made regarding the impact of this experience in helping them to recognize a practical and imaginative way of exploring sensory properties. In the weeks that followed, this experience became increasingly more imaginative utilizing the properties system as a guide for the arrangement of food and environment as well as an opportunity for study. For example, on Friday of the fifth week a group of participants engaged the small office Gallery as a setting for their arrangements of foods. They arranged foods to form sculptures, still lifes, and happenings. Three Times a Day became a gallery experience. In a very real sense, it was a potent indicator of participants' growth and was recognized by the project staff as one type of unobtrusive assessment measure.

Reactions of Participants

At the conclusion of the seminar, participants were asked to rate, on a five point scale, their reactions to each of the major activities they experienced during the six-weeks session. A summary of these ratings is presented on Table Four.

Table Four

Participants' Mean Ratings of Summer Seminar Activities

Activities	N	Mean Rating
Consultants' Presentations		
Historical Review of Art Education	49	4.18
Aesthetics and the Dance	47	4.49
Aesthetics and Found Objects	45	2.82
Aesthetics and the Environment	49	4.39
Kits and Caboodles	46	3.78
Aesthetics and TV Commercials	44	4.11
Aesthetics and Poetry	46	2.98
Evaluation in Aesthetic Education	45	3.69
Aesthetics and Jazz	48	4.75
Survey and Analysis of Works of Art from Various Cultures	48	4.69
Administration and Aesthetic Education (panel)	45	3.27
Dr. Broudy: Presentations and Discussions		
The Import of Aesthetic Education	47	4.38
Nature of Aesthetic Experience	46	4.48
Characteristics of Aesthetic Perception	46	4.59
Sensory, Formal, Technical, and Expressive Properties	46	4.43
Analysis of Works of Art Using Slides	47	4.02
Analysis of Selections from Music	47	3.60
Aesthetic Properties, Parker Article	48	3.92
Criticism, Greene Article	49	3.80
Seminar Artist Sessions	45	4.00
Language Categories and Aesthetic Analysis	39	3.77
Commercial Use of Aesthetic Images in Media	47	3.89
Review and Question Sessions	42	3.83
Other Total Group Activities		
Opening Day Orientation to Seminar	44	3.37
Video Tape of the Dance	44	4.07
Visiting Watts Towers and Artist's Studio	46	3.93
An Experience with Music and an Art Medium	40	4.00
Analysis of Aesthetic Properties Using Everyday Objects	47	3.83
Demonstration of Analysis of a Work of Art by Seminar Participants	48	3.77
Sharing Resource Materials	49	4.16
Viewing and Critiquing "The Invitation"	44	3.05
Multi-Media Presentation	39	4.77
Improvisational Tour, Los Angeles County Museum of Art	45	4.67
Developing Criteria for the Selection of Instructional Materials for Aesthetic Education	46	3.17

Table Four, cont.

Activities	N	Mean Rating
Other Total Group Activities, cont.		
Commercial Exhibit of Instructional Materials for Aesthetic Education	44	2.93
Sharing of Plans for 1975-76	40	3.23
Three Times a Day Aesthetics	47	4.51
School Proposal, Downey Museum	42	3.40
Small Group Activities		
Practice in Analysis of Works of Art	47	3.62
Developing Plans for 1975-76 in Job Alike Groups	46	3.39
Auxiliary Activities		
Library Collection, Books and Papers	46	4.17
Distribution of Individual Copies of Papers	48	4.54
Organization		
Site for Seminar	47	3.72
Pacing of Consultants and Group Activities	43	3.81

The mean rating for all seminar activities was 3.92

There was also space on this rating form for participants to make comments. The range of participants' responses was broad and reflected considerable candidness. A summary of these comments may be found in Appendix B.

A random sample of fifteen participants were interviewed during the second and fourth week of the seminar by a member of the project staff or by one of two participants who were members of the planning committee. Participants' reactions to specific questions were recorded and utilized by the project staff as a product of in-process evaluation. The results of these interviews could be immediately incorporated into the program activities in those situations that were pertinent. Interview questions for both sessions may be found in Appendix B.

The project staff met on each Friday, following the seminar session, to critique the activities of the week and utilize such information as participants' responses to interviews as a basis for altering or modifying the program schedule for the next week.

Participants' responses revealed an awareness to some of the problems that confront teachers, particularly those in school situations, in developing aesthetic education curriculum and achieving administrative approval. The following responses from the first interview are illustrative of these problems:

What do you expect from the seminar?

"Concrete directions toward developing ideas."
"Methods of classroom implementation."
"Synthesizing aesthetic education into the total curriculum."
"Aesthetic vocabulary."
"Development of (1) philosophy which might lead to curriculum development or lead to an application of aesthetics to curriculum."
"Justification of aesthetic programs for dealing with administrators."

Further study of the responses suggested some common needs and problems that were expressed in a number of ways by interviewees. Such questions or statements as "What do we mean by beauty?","What is the meaning of art or aesthetics?", requests for "further definition of aesthetics," and "aesthetic vocabulary for teachers related to each area of the arts: dance, music, art, poetry..." suggested the need for pinpointing basic ideas that are embodied in general concepts of aesthetics.

Interviewees suggested viewing real situations, talking with artists, taking trips to private collections, museums or galleries and talking with critics. Even though these types of learning opportunities were planned in the schedule, the request for these types of activities was reiterated.

One interesting factor observed by the staff was a cohesiveness among participants that developed early in the seminar. This idea was verbalized in the first interview. Responses to the following question are illustrative:

What purpose will you serve to the seminar?

"Sharing of experiences."
"Gain from each other."
"Development and interchange in agencies, recreation centers, schools."

The problem of helping participants move from responding to a work of art on an emotional level to the use of a perceptual approach based upon aesthetics was not an easy transition. There were reservations expressed that reflected concern over making responses to art an intellectual endeavor. An interview question was used in the fourth week to sample the level of participants' thinking about the conceptual framework and perceptual approach. The question and a sampling of responses provided the following information:

What do you now understand about aesthetics?

There has to be a separation between the properties and the emotional level. ntil you go through it you can't understand the properties. If you understand the properties, the feeling level doesn't matter. You'll understand what you are looking at. You can at least deal with it rather than say I don't like it and walk away.

Aesthetics has to do with the analyzing of an art product. The aesthetics are those properties that attract our attention as the sensory, hold our interest and are the basis of the expression in art work. And most of all, aesthetic appreciation is open to <u>everyone</u>!

In the past, I emphasized the "historical;" from now on the perceptual aspects of art will be part of my approach. My experiences as a docent at the Huntington included some concern for the sensory but mostly in terms of feelings, not in relation to shapes and textures.

Thus far this seminar has not added much to my understanding of aesthetics. Even though it has been interesting. In fact, right now we need some models. We haven't had even one! The seminar will be a failure if they don't give people something to follow so that they will feel secure enough to at least try the aesthetic approach. If they don't feel secure they for sure will not even try implementation.

I first thought that "I like" - "don't like" was a satisfactory response. Now I can make judgments based upon criteria, not just personal preferences. I am seeing things that I hadn't seen before.

I am aware of various categories of aesthetic perception; I am comfortable with sensory properties, less sure about formal properties.

Responses from the second interviewing session revealed a perceptive focus on ways the seminar was meeting the purposes and expectations of the participants. The question and a sample of responses revealed the following information.

At this point, what are your conceptions of this seminar?

We need to spend a day putting together some materials we could share at the district level. The sheet distributed today is great to help us articulate ideas. (Single sheet with the four properties.)

I think things are thought provoking. It makes me clarify where I'm at. At times I've felt we're going over it too much but I've also felt that some people need it.

Criticizing the film is something I did not understand... we should have had more preparation. How to deal with films needs more clarification and focus since we ordinarily encounter film much more than paintings.

I still feel somewhat frustrated because I have less background than most participants; I feel I am lagging behind. When paintings are analyzed I don't see what others see. Because of my lack of background, I don't see subtle difference; the significance of a work is not always clear to me.

One thing that's changed my ideas is dealing with students at the feeling level. In the beginning I felt guilty. Now I see a way to go in moving them to an advanced level.

It is helping me to take a new look at art and to appreciate it more open mindedly; to see things not seen before; to better appreciate all forms of art.

I find trying to draw upon each other's experiences very valuable.

The variety of art forms being encountered is also stimulating.

Resource Materials

A variety of reading materials were available to participants. Professor Harry S. Broudy's book titled Enlightened Cherishing was distributed to each participant as a basic reading source. Six papers on aesthetic education were also distributed to the group.

A small library collection of selected books and papers was established. Information from library records indicated that from a selection of twenty papers and twenty-three book titles, two hundred seventeen papers and ninety-seven books were checked out. Fifty-six percent of the participants checked out these materials.

Participants read an average of twelve selections beyond the assigned text and papers distributed during the seminar.

The Aesthetic Eye Inventory

The Aesthetic Eye Inventory was used to assess objective one. This locally developed instrument consisted of ten questions. Five questions called for general responses to questions about aesthetics and five questions called for specific responses to projected images of art works. The Inventory wes administered on the first and last days of the six-weeks summer seminar.

Pre and post data was collected on forty-five of the fifty participants. Four cases were dropped because of incomplete pre and post data. One participant withdrew on the first day due to difficult driving distances. Another participant was selected from a waiting list and joined the group on the second day. Pre test data was not collected on this participant.

A group of six judges, well informed on the theoretical position, rated participants' responses. Based on a sample of pre and post rating of seven parts of scoring one question, the intra-rater correlation was .94 (coefficient of concordance), $p = .01$ (see Appendix B). This result indicates a high agreement among judges. The descriptive statistics of item scores for the Aesthetic Eye Inventory are presented on Tables Five through Fourteen.

Table Five

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question One: Describe what you believe should be the basis for justifying judgments about works of art.

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Subject	45	.02	.15	.02	.15	-.02	-3.35
Sensory	45	.40	.65	.87	.50	.47	13.87***
Formal	45	.22	.52	.60	.50	.38	13.08***
Technical	45	.04	.21	.53	.55	.49	20.05***
Expressive	45	.56	.55	.62	.49	.07	1.92
Judgment	45	.24	.48	.24	.43	.00	.00
Historical	45	.11	.38	.09	.29	-.02	-1.11
Total Score	45	1.60	.94	2.96	1.68	1.36	16.73***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Six

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Two: What special characteristics make an experience aesthetic?

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Subjective-Objective	45	2.31	.87	4.49	1.16	2.18	12.06***
Ambiguous-Specific	45	2.33	1.00	4.31	1.22	1.98	8.51***
Sensory	45	.27	.45	.96	1.19	.69	12.69***
Formal	45	.13	.40	.82	.91	.69	17.22***
Technical	45	.04	.21	.40	.58	.36	13.14***
Expressive	45	.24	.48	.84	.88	.60	13.69***
Critical	45	.09	.29	.40	.78	.31	8.01***
Total Score	45	.76	1.19	3.42	2.82	2.67	20.58***
Combined score	45	5.40	2.37	12.20	4.48	6.80	32.87***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Seven

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Three: Why do you believe aesthetic education is important?

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Image store	45	.22	1.49	1.11	3.18	.89	5.58***
Enlightened judgments	45	.89	2.88	3.78	4.90	2.89	11.85***
Imagination expansion	45	.00	.00	.33	1.26	.33	5.95***
Everyday living improvement	45	2.00	2.48	2.00	2.48	.00	.00
Educational rounding	45	2.67	2.74	1.67	2.38	-1.00	-6.81***
Increase aesthetic perception	45	.56	1.59	3.44	2.34	2.89	19.79***
Increase aesthetic perception of works of art	45	.13	.76	1.78	2.42	1.64	14.07***
Individual development (self improvement)	45	.29	.46	.36	.84	.07	2.18*
Value enhancement	45	.16	.37	.02	.15	-.13	-7.42***
Social improvement	45	.18	.39	.29	.46	.11	4.36***
Improved communication	45	.11	.32	.04	.21	.07	-3.82***
Total Score	45	7.20	3.82	14.82	7.47	7.62	22.51***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Eight

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Four: What terms would you use to describe a work of art?

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-T
Subject	45	.20	.66	.20	.66	.00	.00
Sensory	45	3.18	4.28	7.27	4.35	4.09	14.61***
Formal	45	1.60	1.94	6.31	4.96	4.71	21.58***
Technical	45	.49	1.59	.80	1.25	.31	3.59***
Expressive	45	5.38	6.21	4.00	3.69	-1.38	-4.62***
Judgment	45	.11	.32	.56	1.03	.44	8.78***
Historical	45	1.31	2.00	1.20	1.84	-.11	-.90
Total Score	45	12.29	7.74	20.33	9.54	8.04	18.22***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Nine

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Five: Describe what you believe should be the bases for justifying judgments about works of art.

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Response based upon what actually exists in works	45	.00	.00	3.56	4.84	3.56	16.53***
Degree of formal excellence	45	1.89	2.45	2.56	2.53	.67	4.13***
True to it's genre, purpose	45	1.56	2.34	2.00	2.48	.44	2.73**
Significance relative to other works	45	.56	1.59	2.67	2.52	2.11	17.49***
Total Score	45	4.00	4.07	10.78	4.88	6.78	24.48***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Ten

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Six: Write as many single word responses to this image as you can.

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Subject	45	1.00	1.75	1.04	2.12	.04	.45
Sensory	45	.47	.92	3.91	2.66	3.44	28.96***
Formal	45	1.87	1.96	5.27	2.86	3.40	27.49***
Technical	45	.33	.64	.42	.72	.09	1.96
Expressive	45	3.42	2.62	3.98	2.88	.56	3.66***
Judgment	45	.07	.33	.00	.00	-.07	-4.54***
Historical	45	.93	.99	.51	.69	-.42	-9.19***
Total Score	45	8.09	3.23	15.31	5.50	7.04	31.90***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Eleven

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Seven: Write as many single word responses to this image as you can.

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Subject	45	1.27	1.92	1.42	2.45	.16	1.72
Sensory	45	.78	1.26	8.76	4.22	7.98	39.54***
Formal	45	1.16	1.40	2.76	2.12	1.60	16.37***
Technical	45	.49	.87	.84	1.09	.36	8.36***
Expressive	45	5.22	3.19	4.56	3.24	-.67	-3.73***
Judgment	45	.00	.00	.22	.42	.22	11.89***
Historical	45	.96	.88	.60	.86	.36	-7.48***
Total Score	45	9.87	4.37	19.16	7.28	9.29	32.65***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Twelve

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Eight: Discuss the relationship between these two images which reflect their expressive character.

Variable		Pre Test		Post Test			
	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Subject	45	2.60	1.76	4.56	2.78	1.96	18.10***
Sensory	45	1.07	1.56	2.93	2.68	1.87	13.71***
Formal	45	.71	1.25	1.44	1.59	.73	8.23***
Technical	45	.73	1.16	.87	1.29	.13	2.00*
Expressive	45	3.36	2.66	6.24	3.97	2.89	17.28***
Judgment	45	.16	.37	.16	.47	.00	.00
Historical	45	.49	.87	.44	.81	-.04	-1.05
Total Score	45	9.11	3.92	16.64	4.86	7.53	51.47***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Thirteen

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Nine: Describe your positions to the object presented in this slide.

Variable		Pre Test		Post Test			
	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Subject	45	.02	.15	.93	1.21	.91	16.78***
Sensory	45	.44	.69	3.76	2.62	3.31	28.94***
Formal	45	1.13	1.25	3.27	1.50	2.13	29.16***
Technical	45	.13	.34	.51	1.04	.38	7.50***
Expressive	45	2.11	1.76	4.73	3.01	2.62	17.89***
Judgment	45	.84	1.02	.67	1.31	-.18	-2.46*
Historical	45	.78	1.13	.47	.81	.31	-5.20***
Total Score	45	5.47	2.63	14.31	4.78	8.84	39.80***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Table Fourteen

Differences in Participants' Mean Gain Scores
on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory Test

Question Ten: Choose one image which you think is best and give your reason.

Variable	N	Pre Test Mean	Pre Test S.D.	Post Test Mean	Post Test S.D.	Mean D	Paired-t
Subjective-Objective	45	1.93	1.16	4.38	.72	2.44	13.08***
Ambiguous-Specific	45	2.42	1.10	4.91	.29	2.49	15.47***
Sensory	45	1.18	1.13	2.67	1.67	1.49	17.61***
Formal	45	.64	.83	2.29	1.50	1.64	24.03***
Technical	45	.02	.15	.24	.57	.22	8.35***
Expressive	45	1.07	.96	2.09	1.62	1.02	14.23***
Critical	45	.33	.60	.42	.58	.09	2.62*
Total Score	45	3.24	1.91	7.71	3.19	4.47	32.80***
Combined Score	45	7.60	3.53	17.00	3.64	9.40	51.90***

Note: *=p = .05
**=p = .01
***=p = .001

Analysis of these findings is presented in Chapter Four.

Activities and Assessment Related to Objectives Three and Four

Project objectives three and four centered upon the implementation of aesthetic education concepts in teaching-learning situations. They are stated as follows:

(3) To develop curriculum, instructional materials and strategies that can be tested with pupils in various learning situations.

(4) To explore and develop some methods of assessing the attainment of aesthetic perception and judgment.

During the latter part of the seminar each participant began the process of preparing a curriculum utilizing Dr. Broudy's framework and perceptual approach. The task was difficult for participants because it required the synthesis of ideas and the sorting of concepts that could be used with specific age levels of children. Many teachers expressed concerns regarding the ability of their students to work with the concepts. They wanted more direction or a sample plan that could be used as a model. The project staff kept reiterating the idea of the teacher working as an experimentor. Teachers were encouraged to organize curriculum with a group of objectives and a sequence of ideas to use as beginning points which could be expanded, modified or changed. They were encouraged to think about behavioral outcomes in terms of their students rather than as a measure of the teacher's competency.

Various methods of assessing children's growth were discussed. Possibilities raised included the use of pre and post tape discussions, video tape, periodic observations, checklists, simple written tests, and the counting of the occurance of certain key behaviors.

By the end of the seminar, each participant had prepared individual approaches to curriculum which they could test with children in their specific teaching-learning situation. Analysis was made of the specific content in the plans submitted by individuals utilizing eleven components as criteria. Table Fifteen reports the individual components and the percentage of plans that contained this information.

Table Fifteen

Components and Percentages of Their Occurance in Curriculum Plans

Component	N=50	Percent
Stated goals and objectives	32	64
Suggested instructional materials	28	56
Suggested possible ideas for assessment	23	46
Suggested activities with no concept reference	18	36
Utilized property systems sensory formal technical expressive	16	32
Identified possible sequencing of concepts with related activities suggested	14	28
Considered possible study trips	13	26
Involved activities with teacher committees and/or other groups or person	12	24
Involved developing a program utilizing artists as resources	9	18
Developed a new course offering	6	12
Suggested way of integrating aesthetic education into other curriculum areas	4	8

Activities and Assessment Relating to Objective Five

Objective five, listed below, dealt with documentation of the seminar.

(5) To record the progress of this project as an example of inquiry into aesthetic education.

The basic record of the progress of the project was maintained as a daily log. The Daily Log became a record of each day's major activity and activity leader, attendance, and participants' reactions and questions. In addition, a daily summary was made by the recorder and an evaluation or interpretive commentary was entered by the project director (see Appendix B).

The preparation of descriptive aspects of the final report of the Aesthetic Eye Project is based largely on the documentation provided in the Daily Log.

Documentation of seminar activities was also recorded as black and white photographs and colored slides. Photographs used in this report were selected from this documentation.

PHASE III, CLASSROOM IMPLEMENTATION

Visitation Records

One requirement for participation in this project involved the preparation of a curriculum plan with ideas for assessment that could be field tested with children. Each participant began their implementation with children during September 1976. Implementation was monitored through visitations by the project director and a staff member. A Visitation Report Form was used to record observations of each teaching-learning situation. The form contained a section for rating aesthetic applications in the physical environment, teacher-pupil work with the four aesthetic property systems, and evidence of assessment (see Appendix C). In addition, there were sections for reporting discussions with participant, pupils, administrators, other viewers, and observer's comments.

Arrangements for visitation were made with individual participants. They were asked to make visitor's appointment with their administrator following the two hour site visitation. The purpose of this appointment was to talk informally about the project and to support the efforts of participants to develop an aesthetic education program in the school.

Sixty percent of the participants were visited. A summary of the visitation ratings are reported on Table Sixteen.

Table Sixteen

Summary of Monitor Ratings on a Five Point Scale (5.00) of Visitations to Teaching-Learning Situations

Aesthetic Applications	N=30	Mean (0-5)
Physical Environment		
Aesthetic objects on display		3.67
Serious art works exhibited		4.37
Popular art forms displayed		2.53
Student work presented aesthetically		3.50
Self-instruction devices organized aesthetically		2.10
Concern for developing an awareness of:		
Sensory properties		4.63
Formal properties		3.03
Technical properties		2.27
Expressive properties		2.87
Concern for assessing pupil growth		2.93

Following each observation, a conference was held with the participant. These conversations frequently focused on a new awareness of how well the conceptual framework and perceptual approach of aesthetics worked with children. Some participants shared plans for developing ideas with children. Others were seeking help with plans and/or assessment.

In non-school situations involving agency participants, they described ways they had incorporated the conceptual framework into their particular teaching situation.

For example, Self Help Graphics was working with artists to integrate ideas into the curriculum developed for an Art Mobile that serves children in a ghetto section of Los Angeles City.

Further information on the Visitation Record recording conferences with pupils, administrators, and other viewers indicated that discussions were held with 47% of the administrators. Other administrators were attending district meetings or involved in an activity which could not be interrupted. Discussions were held with non-participant teachers within the building in 7% of the visitations. Children were interviewed in 23% of the visitations. The discussions with administrators were, in most cases, very positive. They expressed considerable interest in helping participants to share their work with the staff. Some indicated that parents had made positive comments about the values they observed in the program. Only two administrators expressed primary concern with their academic program and had little time for observing the participants.

Some members of teaching staffs responded very favorably to the program and indicated an interest in working with the approach developed by the participant. Discussions with children provided additional clues as to their understanding of the property systems and their experiences with aesthetic ideas, objects and materials.

Instructional Materials and Their Use

An important concern of participants in school situations was the availability of instructional materials. They reported that a very limited number of visual materials were supplied by school districts. The project staff anticipated this problem and made a group of these materials available.

The project provided three types of visual materials that children could use for encounters with works of art. These materials included: type one, museum postcard reproductions and booklets on the work of individual artists; type two, museum filmstrips; and type three, folk art objects. During the November workshop, twenty museum postcard reproductions, twenty booklets and two filmstrips were distributed to each participant.

In March, a group of ten boxes containing art objects from various cultures was organized. These were titled "collectables." The art objects collected were predominantly Mexican folk art because there were large numbers of Mexican American children in many of the implementation sites. The folk art objects served an additional purpose for children. They were provided to develop and extend the concept of buffism (learning the role of the serious collector).

Each box of collectables contained roughly twenty objects, two picture booklets on Pre-Columbian art and a teacher's booklet (see Appendix C). The teacher's booklet described both the purpose of the collectable box and procedures for reporting information about children's responses to the folk art objects. Participants checked out the collectable boxes for one month and made reports (see Appendix C).

Time was scheduled in each of three workshop sessions for participants to work on strategies for using these materials with children. They worked in job alike groups and were provided with a form to record the following information:

grade level of children participating in the activity
type of group i.e. total class, small group, learning center
statement of objective
identification of specific instructional material
proposed instructional strategy
possible assessment technique

A compilation of these records was distributed to participants (see Appendix C).

The project provided a fifty dollar allotment to each participant to purchase instructional materials. Participants used criteria they developed in the seminar in making their selections. Thirty-four of the fifty participants purchased materials. Twenty-two participants in this group purchased books with many large art reproductions. Twelve purchased such materials as additional museum postcard reproductions, filmstrips, folk art objects and supplies for making visual materials more durable.

Teachers' Logs

At the first workshop meeting in October, a discussion was held on the need for documenting the testing of curriculum approaches in practical situations with children. Participants were asked to maintain a log or record that reported this development. This request posed some problems with both school and non-school participants. Classroom teachers raised problems regarding the number of record keeping tasks they had to maintain for the academic programs. Non-school people felt that it was difficult because of the number of children they worked with during the year. Recognizing these problems, the project staff indicated the importance of this documentation in helping fellow teachers, administrators and other community agency people to initiate aesthetic education programs. In May, seventy-two percent of the participants submitted their logs.

Review of the teacher logs provided insight into ways they worked with the property systems. The various preparations made to initiate or extend learning activities, observations of children's responses to encounters with works of art, unexpected occurances that enriched an activity and approaches to assessment. Appendix C contains selections from teacher logs to illustrate their approaches to implementation.

An analysis of participants' logs was made using criteria applied to curriculum plans developed during the summer seminar. Table Seventeen reports this analysis.

Table Seventeen

Components and Percentages of Their Occurance in Curriculum Plans

Component	N=36	Percent
Stated goals and objectives	31	86
Suggested instructional materials	28	78
Suggested possible ideas for assessment	21	58
Suggested activities with no concept reference	12	33
Utilized property systems sensory formal technical expressive	31	86
Identified possible sequencing of concepts with related activities suggested	21	58
Considered possible study trips	6	16
Involved activities with teacher committees and/or other groups or person	12	33
Involved developing a program utilizing artists as resources	1	3
Developed a new course offering	5	14
Suggested way of integrating aesthetic education into other curriculum areas	4	11

The problem of assessment was given serious consideration by participants. A selection of participant developed instruments used to assess various dimensions of the property systems was taken from some of the logs to demonstrate their work with assessment (see Appendix C).

Reporting Peak Experiences and Use of Property Systems

To gain further insights into the extent to which participants were able to reflect upon the effectiveness and/or success of a particular activity that seemed to further aesthetic learning, they were asked to describe "peak experiences." These experiences were identified as significant instances in their work with children when every part of the activity fit or complemented learning processes. It generated spontaneity and perhaps unexpected involvement and outcomes. Appendix C contains copies of peak experiences. The following are a few examples of "peak experiences" cited by participants:

> At one of the learning centers a viewlex is set up with the filmstrip "A Walk Through the Los Angeles County Museum." When we have reading stations, the children at Station 3 are free to go to the centers, do reading games or go to the art center, listening center, etc. Three

children voluntarily got together, turned on the viewlex and proceeded to discuss the works of art they saw using a pointer to point out different aspects of the paintings, drawings, or sculptures and led the questions. I was sitting at Station 1 teaching a reading lesson and these children were on the opposite side of the room and were acting totally independent and were self-motivated to do this. (4th grade teacher)

When we were talking about composition, students were asked to relate composition to music, literature, poetry, dance. Individuals with special backgrounds and interests explained "how composition is used in music." This seemed to help many students understand properties in new ways. (6th grade teacher)

All six art classes of 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students were excited and interested in the sculpture, and since the exhibit was in the classroom, were very aware when pieces were borrowed for other classrooms. They treated each piece with respect and care, needing very little instruction on how to handle the pieces. Many questions and discussions were generated by the presence of the sculpture. The art students brought in other students between classes to see the sculpture. (7th and 8th grade art teacher)

Field Trip to Municipal Art Gallery - Great! Class broken up into three small groups. One group saw slides of shapes and colors in everyday architecture. One group with the docent through gallery - she had them drawing shapes and discussing feelings before even going into the gallery. Other groups at art center with "hands-on" project. All children participated in all three activities. Parents who went commented on value of trip, and on personal gain for themselves. Great discussion the next day! (1st-3rd grade teacher)

Total school environment was affected by the emphasis placed on aesthetics at the beginning of the year. Color, form, music, opinions by students, and appreciation of what student artists have done is quite evident as you walk through the school. Monthly programs of performing artists including the opera, Don Pasquale, jazz group of Are DePew, dance, choral, instrumental pantomime, puppetry group from the Los Angeles Recreation Department, as well as the student group from Marshall High School doing "Charlie Brown" were presented. The school attracted free performances, paid performances from P.T.A. and student body as well as the Performing Tree from our district funds. All in all, the level of aesthetic appreciation has increased immensely. (Building principal)

The most logical place to implement the program was through a complete revamping of my touring techniques at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, and my desire to spread the knowledge of what I learned in the hopes of turning on others. In my initial contact with the students (usually high school age, sometimes junior high) I attempted to make them feel at ease in the gallery through casual chatter in an informal give-and-take atmosphere. I emphasized during our first few minutes together that the students would see art that they would not necessarily like at first glance, or possibly at all, and that this feeling would be O.K. and understandable.

> My desire would be for them to be able to see art without making judgments before it was understood. Everyone seemed to give a big sigh once they knew they could express their feelings. I did provide relevant information on technique, materials, theory, and art history but through self-discovery and careful looking the students were able to glean a good portion of this information on their own. After the tour was over, I made a special point of telling the students that this technique is somewhat new and in the beginning stages of development. It seems to be a general feeling among the students and teachers that I toured that participating and concentrating on visual aesthetics rather than lecturing were the major highlights of their experience, mainly because they were made to feel their views were important and necessary to understanding what they were seeing. (Museum docent)

The property systems perceptual approach which Dr. Broudy developed with participants involved the use of a theoretical position as a basis for making practical curriculum applications in various learning situations. For many participants, this way of conceptualizing could not be fully accepted until it was tested with children. In general, participants' criteria for success included such realistic factors as:

practicality - will the property system and the perceptual approach work with my class

motivation - will children evidence a sustained interest in working with this structure so that it becomes a part of their thinking and feeling

teacher competency - will the plan for curriculum development and instructional strategies lead to the achievement of objectives.

After eight months of work with children, this was a critical area to examine. Participants were asked to assess the structure in two ways. First by listing ways the structure affected practice in classroom or other learning situations (number 1 below) and secondly, by listing ways the structure affected practices in any situation beyond the classroom (number 2 below). The following responses from participants provide significant evidence of their assessment of the use of the structure in learning situations and with teaching staffs and parents. Perhaps the strongest factor reflected in these responses is the attainment of teacher competency in working with the structure (see Appendix C).

1) Provided a new concept for dealing with the basics of art. Awakened me to the wide varieties of material which can be used as a stimulus in an art room.
   Provided a structure for discussion of works of art.

2) Most important - it helped me to perceive the world much more in depth, with far greater sensitivity than before. This kind of enrichment has broadened me, and thus enables me to project that awareness to others.

1) It has helped me create a preordering of ideas in a sequence that I have found extremely beneficial in terms of time and classroom tension.

I feel more secure as a person and a teacher in what I am doing, and why I am doing it. It is easier to eliminate that which is not relevant in analysis and discussion regarding prepared projects, courses and master teaching!

2) It would not be possible for me to experience or even function within the project without acknowledging the overflow into my personal life. Inner city teaching demands emotional/intellectual responses as a consultant, this has always overflowed into my home life via exhaustion, tension. The preordering mentioned above (1) has helped me specifically in this area, plus the reinforcement of value in thearts. I do not have to separate my home and school environment in terms of how I perceive it. How I react remains the same.

1) Much more class discussion and critique of visual aids (filmstrips, reproductions, etc.) and individual projects (during and after completion).

Greater emphasis on relationships in learning situations. Greater preliminary input of "walking through" the critical as well as technical aspects of a given project.

2) Working (very slowly) with members of my department in showing them approaches to making their classes more verbally and "critically" oriented. Showing them possibilities for games, etc.

Have given xeroxed copies of worksheets, information, etc., to other interested teachers met in my graduate classes at Cal State, L.A. (one school absolutely went bananas over the sheet made up by the elementary school teacher from Alhambra - checklist) ...so bit by bit it gets out.

1) The language developed by the workshop has served as a basis for all learning experiences in kindergarten. Children are now asked to describe what they see in terms of sensory, expressive, creative properties. They also compare likeness and differences.

2) Article in Instructor was a great help regarding placing new terms to learning situations.

Personally, the Aesthetic Eye Project has opened new vistas for enriched viewing for me and my family. Life has taken on a new and wonderful scope.

1) a) This was the first year famous art pictures were discussed in the classroom on a regular basis. b) Art centers have been used oftener. c) Art lessons have been more than just drawing. d) Various ways of presenting the aesthetics have been practiced.

2) I have been able to use what I've learned for my own daily living. Reborn aesthetically!

Participant Workshop Attendance

Attendance for the five workshop sessions held during the school year was relatively high except for the final meeting in May. Absenteeism among the school people for this meeting was reported as illness or the competition of scheduled academic testing programs. Some community agency people reported that absenteeism was due to competing program responsibilities or personal reasons. Table Eighteen presents percentages of participants who attended workshop sessions.

Table Eighteen

Participants' Attendance Record, Five Workshop Sessions

Percentage of Participants	Number of Sessions Attended
36	5
36	4
20	3
6	2
2	1

Workshop Assessment

Two assessments were made of workshops held on scheduled days between October 1975 and May 1976. The first assessment was conducted at the close of the November workshop. Participants were asked to respond on a five-point scale (5.00 high) to five items that listed activities for the day. Table Nineteen presents the activities and the mean for each item.

Table Nineteen

Participants' Assessment of Workshop, November 14, 1975

Activities	N=33	Mean (0-5)
1. Developing ways of utilizing postcard art reproductions, filmstrips, and 3D materials		3.70
2. Three times a day aesthetics		4.24
3. Sharing site visitations		2.91
4. Planning for Dr. Broudy		3.58
5. Cross-group sharing		3.64

The second assessment was made during the final workshop session in May. Participants were asked to rate, on a five-point scale, their reactions to a list of activitities covering the five meetings. A summary of these ratings (5.00 high) is presented in Table Twenty.

Table Twenty

Participants' Assessment of Five Workshop Sessions

	Activities	N=33	Mean (0-5)
1.	Discussion of plans for reporting	29	2.66
2.	Job alike discussion groups	33	3.45
3.	Discussion with Dr. Broudy	33	4.58
4.	Developing strategies for using postcards, booklets, and collectables	32	3.47
5.	Viewing slides	33	4.00
6.	Three times a day aesthetics	32	4.25
7.	Sharing of classroom approaches	33	4.12
8.	Total group discussion	31	3.65
9.	Periodic evaluation	30	3.23
10.	Time for writing responses	30	3.23

This rating form also included space for participants to make comments. A summary of these comments may be found in Appendix C.

The Project Assessment Form

With a view toward studying the project as an inservice model, the Project Assessment Form was administered to participants during the May 1976 workshop session. The purpose of this assessment was to gather general reflections and impressions of project experiences to include the summer seminar, five workshop meetings, implementation in the classroom or other learning situations, effects beyond implementation, and plans for continued work in the area of aesthetics. Participants' responses were analyzed and organized into broad categories. The responses are briefly summarized with a more complete listing of categories and responses included in Appendix C.

Summer Seminar. The most frequently mentioned seminar experiences included opportunities to:

work with Dr. Broudy in the development of the structure and aesthetic perception method and in clarifying conceptions about the nature and process of aesthetic education.

talk with artists from the fields of the visual arts, dance and music.

study aesthetic education papers and instructional materials.

involvement with school and non-school people provided new perspectives and friends.

Suggestions for replicating the seminar include:

Time: Schedule all day sessions and thus reduce the length of the seminar.

Schedule the seminar early in the summer and use four days of each week for total and small group meetings. Leave the fifth day open for independent study and development of instructional materials.

Space: Arrange for a work center or laboratory and schedule time for participants to develop instructional materials.

Establish the library in the meeting room so that participants can examine reading materials during free time.

Consultants: Schedule Dr. Broudy for a week, followed by a week without him and then have another week with him.

Involve more consultants from dance, music, drama.

Invite art critics from the community to discuss their approach in critiquing an exhibit or an event.

Job alike groups: Increase time for the exchange of ideas.

Organize these groups with a leader and schedule time for sharing ideas and instructional strategies.

Provide more time for Dr. Broudy to consult with these groups.

Speciiic activities: Introduce the discussion of aesthetics and aesthetic education earlier in seminar program.

Schedule more group work on aesthetic perception techniques.

Increase demonstrations on working with the structure and perceptual approach.

Include workshop sessions to develop instructional materials.

Work on the development of vocabulary.

Relate aesthetic perception to right and left brain research.

Include more study trips.

Provide more direction for implementation.

Increase activities involving participation and decrease lectures.

Statements regarding weakness or least successful aspects of the seminar included:

Visits to various places where art is made.

Spoon feeding of how to describe the aesthetic properties in a work of art.

Presentation by core participants.

Large group meetings.

Assessment of the five workshops. Analysis of statements on the assessment of the five workshops revealed that four activities were most frequently mentioned. They included:

working with Professor Broudy.

sharing ways that individual participants worked with children.

sharing ideas and problems in job-alike groups.

being together as a group with a common purpose.

Suggestions for repeating a series of workshops ranged from scheduling two-day workshops to increased time for work in job-alike and/or small group discussions. The need for planning a communication system for sharing project information and materials was frequently mentioned. Critical comments were few and dealt with frequent and lengthy interactions by individual participants in total and/or small group discussions. Some comments reflected dissatisfaction with some of the activities.

Impressions of implementation. In response to the request that participants record their impressions of implementation in the classroom and in other learning situations, some participants chose to list classroom activities such as work on aesthetic perception vocabulary, food tasting, establishing learning centers and use of the "buff" technique. Other participants focused on student benefits, awareness of change in teaching role, communication, and other needs. The following responses are illustrative:

Student response: Students gained appreciable more from the art experience as a result of the exposure to aesthetic perception.

Most successful when children had time enough to explore and investigate a piece of visual art and translate to their level of development.

Easier than I thought -- kids so responsive and uninhibited. Group involvement was consistently high and productive when the total length of time involved is considered.

Communication: Sharing this experience with high school art teachers and faculty.

Showing other adults the benefits of aesthetic perception and how to communicate this enthusiasm and knowledge to others.

Awareness of change in teaching role: It has helped me to firm up my aesthetic teaching, to give it a more significant structure, to give balance - verbal-cognitive means of approaching a visual-intuitive learning process. New ideas for presenting visual ideas to students including a print center, a book center ... I am developing a greater awareness of how to teach non-verbal students to verbalize aesthetics.

My whole approach to teaching has changed - I analyze more - we approach discussions more openly - products are more thought out - senses more acute - and my class has grown 100% in their ability to perceive from a shopping center landscape to a work of art. It's really amazing.

A whole different approach of sharing and receiving responses in a classroom rather than lecture series.

Some needs: Assistance in evaluating implementation into more monitoring help.

Specific models for continuing with extensions in drama, literature, and music, and ways to make transitions into these areas.

Effects beyond implementation. Participants responses to effects beyond implementation include ways they worked with school personnel and/or community groups, their work with students and recognition of an increase in personal competency. A sample of these statements presents insights into participants' activities and levels of self awareness.

Work with school personnel and/or community: Two teachers have aesthetic learning centers and approaches due to a faculty presentation I made in February. Our district is having a workshop next year on aesthetics.

We have met with the City Recreation Director and arts and crafts coordinator to brainstorm ideas for coordinating our efforts. All parties appear to be enthusiastic concerning busing students to the city and center for exhibits and workshops. This would also involve teachers.

School inservice; parent orientation and exposure, school newsletter sent home to all parents.

Working with students: Getting student to feel that art is natural part of life, not just a picture on the wall.

The approach is working. The feedback from the students is more than what is expected.

Personal competency: Has affected my whole approach to art education - always knew these aspects given in art class - never thought of extensive importance as appreciation.

Best personal growth - increased ability to deal with artistic works. This can be communicated to friends and relatives and seems to have been most appreciated.

Teachers, librarian and ESL specialists motivated by my workshop on aesthetic education; use aesthetic education materials in their classrooms. Librarian has the library bulletin boards decorated with pictures showing colors, etc. ESL teachers set up a Mexican Museum in their room for Cinco de Mayo. Principal has invited members of the school Board of Education and community to visit the museum, many favorable comments from everyone.

I gave a workshop for about ten teachers and I realized how much I've grown in my thinking and I was able with the help of the kids to get it all across - wow! Me not an art major and my participants weren't either and the feedback good!

A personal satisfaction, worth and knowing. It is not enough to be vague about what you do, what you know and what you think and feel. Being self conscious about one's sensibilities is a problem for an artist!

Plans for continued work on aesthetic education. Participants cited extensions of the project to include further program development, work with students, teachers, committees, and the community and a few were unsure because of employment problems. Examples of these statements include the following:

Program development: Continue to develop new evaluative materials in aesthetics, especially in recreation. Develop new aesthetic learning aids. Continue to develop a visual aesthetic learning center. Carry the message to feeder schools and other high schools in the district.

I plan to continue the aesthetic learning center next year with the same or new enrichment activities. I hope to develop aesthetic analysis and vocabulary in my Science units and try to experiment with music and drama in an aesthetic structure.

Continue with all of my ideas that I didn't get to do. I will be teaching an aesthetic class this summer to elementary students. I will definately have aesthetics be a part of my teaching - whenever and whatever I teach. I wish that I could work with teachers - sharing with them what I know. I will be leading a small two-day seminar in my district for one teacher from each school.

I plan to continue and re-do the department curriculum and work on filmstrips that relate to this program for future classroom and teacher use. There is so much reorganization I want done; I'm just grateful for another summer coming up.

Continue the incorporation into the district curriculum guide.

Work with students, teachers and committees: Attemp to implement objectives not met, such as docents from the high school coming to the middle school to serve as leaders-experts. Attempt to interest a larger number of teachers on the value of aesthetic education and how to implement the teaching of it. To encourage and support district programs and proposals in this area. To serve on the district steering committee in art education.

I am on our district Fine Arts Curriculum Committee and hope to provide materials for teachers that can direct them towards teaching aesthetics in the classroom.

To present an inservice program for teachers grades 4-8 in September to use our new aesthetic objects (slides, replicas and prints) in all the classrooms. (This is sponsored by the assistand superintendent.) I am now taping cassettes to go with slides of sculpture and prints and ethnic objects as teacher preparation aids.

Work with community: I am involved in the setting up of an art council in the city of Beverly Hills for the coming year. I hope in some way to bring this in - how I am not quite sure. Although I have already discussed it with the head of the high school art department.

I want to continue developing gallery or museum education in various forms - by pilot program mainly concerned with the tours - I would like to develop more ways of reaching out to the public and making the gallery environment an exciting one to visit. Ideas for expansion so far: more teacher workshops to get our techniques back to the classroom; training guides to relate to visitors on non-tour situation - educators visits on a one-to-one level; more slide presentations of exhibits and others; develop a connection between activities at workshops and gallery experiences.

Other plans: I plan to get out of teaching. However, if I were to stay, I would try to work as a part-time resource teacher to provide elementary teachers with the information I have gained in the project. I would encourage teachers to apply for participation in a future project.

I don't know - nothing definite as yet.

Participation in Pilot Centers

Another indication of the extent to which this project proved meaningrul to participants was the level of their interest in continued involvement. Participants were asked to indicate their willingness to have their classroom serve as a pilot center during the next year. Nineteen participants agreed to the idea of leading a pilot center. Nine indicated that, for personal reasons, they could not undertake this commitment and thirteen were unsure. They felt that more consideration was required before making this decision.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

In reviewing the project, it was apparent that results had met the goal at a level beyond initial expectations. There was growth in knowledge of aesthetics and curricula were devised and implemented. More importantly, an *espirit de corps* developed in the group that built an aesthetic education momentum which will continue after the project. At the same time, it was evident the gains were made from a starting point of limited applications regarding the aesthetic perception technique. The gains were modest in terms of a fully developed understanding of aesthetics. Yet, making even these modest beginnings a part of every teachers' repertoire is an enormous achievement.

The complexity of the project, coupled with the size of the undertaking, required the use of many means of assessment. Therefore, each phase will be dealt with as a subsection, followed by general project conclusions.

PHASE I, PLANNING SESSION

The staff was able to reach agreement with Dr. Broudy about basic insights that were to be the focus of subsequent work. A general schedule was established, topics were chosen, consultants selected and general evaluation strategies determined.

Conclusions

- The choice of a particular stance, limiting the scope of project objectives to the aesthetic perception technique with a major focus on the visual arts, provided specific content that gave definition to the project.
- The inclusion of representative project participants from many learning situations created an excellent sounding board for ideas about both activities and content.
- The inclusion of community agency representatives gave added dimension to discussions.

Implications

- The aesthetic perception technique provides an excellent starting point with generally naive participants.
- Further work in the area of aesthetics would require the definintion and presentation of other stances and their application to all forms of art.
- Where possible, planning sessions should include representative project participants.
- Where possible, representatives from community agencies should be included in planning sessions.

PHASE II, SUMMER SEMINAR

Summary of Results: Objective One - To develop knowledge of the nature of aesthetic perception and judgment.

A pre-test/post-test comparison of scores on questions one through five in the Aesthetic Eye Inventory shows gains that indicate the following:

an increasing use of a number of descriptors of works within the property systems taught in the aesthetic perception technique (with the exception of technical properties).

a consistent shift of descriptors used from a majority in expressive, judgmental and historical categories to the full range of property systems.

consistent increases that indicate shifts from use of a subjective to an objective frame of reference and from the use of ambiguous statements to specific property system references in describing works of art.

an increased incidence of arguments in support of aesthetic education based on the position developed in the project.

an increased number of statements of reasons for justifying aesthetic judgments consistent with the position developed in the project.

Conclusions: Objective One

- The aesthetic perception training approach is an effective vehicle for increasing the number and range of descriptors of works of art. It can bring about increased objectivity and specificity in references to properties of works of art.
- With training and practice, participants can learn to support arguments for aesthetic education and justify aesthetic judgments with some consistency based on an aesthetic perception position.

Implications: Objective One

- The aesthetic perception training position of the project can be used as the basis for inservice education of school and community agency personnel that will increase their ability to describe works of art.
- Given basic aesthetic perception training and knowledge, school and community agency personnel can present consistent arguments for aesthetic education based on systems of properties of the works.
- Given basic aesthetic perception training, school and community agency personnel can support aesthetic judgments with some consistency, basing them on aesthetic perception concepts.

Summary of Results: Objective Two - To make application of knowledge of aesthetic preception with serious and popular works of art.

A pre-test/post-test comparison of scores on questions one through ten in the Aesthetic Eye Inventory (responses to works) shows gains that indicate the following:

an increased number of responses to works of art with significant increases in each property system category with the exception of the technical properties.

a consistent shift in attention to different properties, with a change in focus away from personal response to subject matter and expressive properties to the full range of properties systems taught in the aesthetic perception technique.

A review of interview results and visitation reports indicated an increasing facility and ease in encountering and responding to works of art. Participants reported both their own feelings of increased security with the use of the aesthetic perception approach and their confidence in using it with their students. Community agency participants reported building aesthetic property system encounters with art works as an alternative to the more often used historical information approach.

Conclusions: Objective Two

- Using the property systems of the aesthetic perception technique, participants responded to a wider range of properties of works of art.
- With the aesthetic perception technique base, participants responded with a greater focus on the work rather than their own subjective response.
- With property systems as a structure, participants encountered art works with more ease.
- Using the property systems as a structure, participants taught children to encounter art works with more confidence.

Implications: Objective Two

- The aesthetic perception training technique can provide a basic structure for increased and improved responses to works of art.
- With practice using the property systems structure, school and community agency personnel can become comfortable encountering and responding to unfamiliar works of art.
- The property systems structure can provide an effective basis for teaching children to encounter and respond knowledgeably to works of art. Within non-school settings, for example museums, the property systems structure can function as the basis of an encounter with the aesthetics of art as an alternative to the often used historical approach.

Summary of Results: Objective Three - To develop aesthetic perception curriculum, instructional materials and strategies for use with children.

Plans for implementation, preparation of instructional materials, and visitation reports indicated the following:

All participants (100%) prepared plans for implementation of aesthetic perception training during the school year. Seventy percent of the participants purchased materials for use in learning situations. Visitation reports and participant reporting indicate that all participants used their training in some way during the year. Seventy-two percent submitted curricula in May. Curricula ranged from fully delineated plans for a program to listing of activities that were more loosely tied to specific aesthetic perceptions outcome.

Forty-four percent of participants prepared instructional materials. These ranged from art learning centers and games for children to questionnaires for gallery and museum participants. Twenty percent of participants used the collectable boxes with children and an analysis of responses indicates that a majority found the use of actual objects as a particularly effective way to have children encounter art works.

Visitation reports and participants reporting indicate that the aesthetic perception training formed the basis for techniques taught to children.

Conclusions: Objective Three

- The development of plans based on an aesthetic perception approach, the preparation of curricula and materials proved to be one effective way of initiating implementation of aesthetic education in both school and community agency settings.

- The range of participant expertise, their development during a program, and the teaching settings to which they return resulted in a range of instructional materials and degrees of implementation.

- The property systems and the aesthetic perception technique were adopted as a structure for developing aesthetic education curricula, materials, and teaching strategies.

- The provision of art objects and reproductions for participants to use both individually and in the collectable boxes made the important task of encountering works of art more easily accessible to children.

Implications: Objective Three

- School and community agency personnel, given training and practice can plan and implement aesthetic education programs based on an aesthetic perception approach. While there will be variations in interpretation, the structure, when adopted, does provide a basis for work with children that can be used with confidence.

- Where possible, materials used as the experimental basis of aesthetic perception training should include three dimensional reproductions and/or real art works.

- Provisions should be made for providing materials to be used in the preparation for and during implementation.

Summary of Results: Objective Four - To explore and develop methods of assessing the attainment of aesthetic perception and judgment.

The pre-test/post-test comparison scores in questions one through ten in the Aesthetic Eye Inventory, staff observations, and log of project activities, unobtrusive measures, participant reporting, and visitation records indicate the following:

The Aesthetic Eye Inventory was one way of assessing the attainment of knowledge of aesthetic dimensions of works of art and its application. The systems taught were acquired and used when discussing art works. Both the time required for administration (30 min.) and the scoring were feasible given the time and resources available.

Staff observations and recording of project activities in a log provided evidence that confirmed the results of this inventory. For example, Professor Broudy, when he returned in January 1976, commented on the increased incidence of aesthetic perception vocabulary in the conversations of project participants.

Unobtrusive measures, the checking out of library materials, and the visual records of three-times-a-day aesthetics activities provided further evidence that project participants had acquired and were using aesthetic perception techniques.

Fifty-six percent of participants checked out library materials and read an average of twelve selections beyond the assigned text and papers distributed during the seminar.

A review of three-times-a-day visual record revealed an increasingly more organized and aesthetically appealing presentation of these activities.

Participants' reporting and visitation records provide evidence of effective participant assessment instruments based on the Aesthetic Eye Inventory. These range from formal written responses by teenaged students to the analysis of tape recorded conversations with younger children. Simple counts of responses falling within the categories of the aesthetic perception techniques made by participants revealed an increase of the use of the property systems by children taught using this approach.

Conclusions: Objective Four

- Assessment instruments using property systems and increased responses within categories did provide an adequate assessment of increased aesthetic perception and judgment within feasible time limits.

- While time consuming, visitations and interviews confirmed the acquisition of the aesthetic perception technique and its application both in encountering works of art and in teaching.

- Use of library resources indicated that many participants moved beyond simple perception beginnings to a more sophisticated understanding of aesthetic encounters.

- Increasingly sophisticated presentation of three-times-a-day aesthetics indicated a growth in understanding of aesthetics and in the ability to apply the knowledge in situations beyond the encounters in the project.

- Given the aesthetic perception categories as a structure and the Aesthetic Eye Inventory as a model, school and community agency personnel were able to devise simple assessment instruments. They found these useful tools within their implementation settings.

Implications: Objective Four

- The Aesthetic Eye Inventory should be used and further refined as an instrument for assessing the attainment of aesthetic perception and judgment.

- Where feasible, visitation and interviews should be used to augment formal assessment procedures to provide anecdotal evidence of increasing knowledge.

- Application of aesthetic knowledge and training in the area of food preparation and presentation provides an excellent vehicle for building group interaction while providing opportunities for expression. The recording of such activities visually can provide evidence of growing sophistication that is a powerful presentation.

- School and community agency personnel beginning aesthetic education should be encouraged to devise and use simple assessment instruments to record increases in aesthetic responses.

Summary of Results: Objective Five - To record the progress of this project.

A daily log of project activities was written for every seminar session. It provides a reference for activities in relation to one another and a store of impressions that are often difficult to recall.

Visual records, photographs taken throughout the course of the project, provided evidence of growth that was of a kind that may be overlooked or not easily described in written materials.

Forms were prepared and filled out by participants that record project activities and results in several areas:

plans for implementation
implementation activities
use of instructional materials
spin-offs from the project

effects of the project beyond the
immediate implementation
peak experiences for children resulting
from project implementation
use of and reaction to collectables
visitations

Records were kept of participant attendance, use of library materials, and visitations.

Conclusions: Objective Five

- While the organization, preparation, and maintenance of documentation was often a difficult and time consuming task, it provided invaluable resources for project reporting and further work in the area of aesthetic education.
- Participant reaction to the request for documentation was often a complaint. They were not used to a requirement that impressions be documented.
- While difficult to prepare, the anecdotal report of aspects of the program and its implementation provided valuable evidence of participant growth and effective implementation.
- Cumulative data assembled from the simple records of aspects like attendance was a useful tool in making inferences about the effect of training as it was traced to implementation.

Implications: Objective Five

- Where feasible, logs of events and anecdotal records of project events should be maintained.
- Simple records such as frequency of activities and attendance should be maintained as a basis for cumulative records for project effects.
- Provision for administrative time required to maintain and analyze records should be included in funding applications.

PHASE III, CLASSROOM IMPLEMENTATION

Summary of Results: Objective One - To assist participants in using aesthetic perception based curricula and evaluate the effectiveness of project implementation.

Visitation records and implementation documents indicate the following:

Review of records of visitations made to sixty percent of the participants, reports of implementation made by seventy-two percent of the participants, and review of the documents recording implementation events indicate that the project affected the work of every participant. There was a range of use from the adoption of the structure as a check on children's responses to the development of aesthetic learning centers.

Analysis of visitation records indicate that during implementation participants displayed serious works of art, presented their students' works aesthetically and arranged for students to encounter works of art. When activities were observed, the focus was most often directed toward sensory properties of works as a starting point. A range of assessment was evident from checklists of participants' imperssions to sophisticated pre-test/post-test designs.

Conclusions: Objective One

- While there was a range of implementation applications, the program did result in the aesthetic perception approach being used by the participants. There were indications that the use would continue after the project was completed.
- Aesthetic perception training did increase the use of serious art works as a part of the teaching repetoire of project participants.
- School and community agency personnel can become more aware of the æsthetic dimensions of the environment they prepare for students and their responses to student work.
- The property systems provide useful categories for talking with children about art. The usual starting point appeared to be sensory properties.
- A range of assessment activities were undertaken from those relying on participant judgment to controlled pre-test/post-test.

Implications: Objective One

- School and community agency personnel should be encouraged to acquire and use art works as a resource for teaching. Given the basis of an approach, they will use such materials.
- School and community agency personnel should be asked to consider aesthetic dimensions of their approach as a part of aesthetic education training. Such materials should be considered in the development of their activities.
- A continuing contact and visitation program should be a part of the implementation of aesthetic education projects to ensure support and reinforcement of participant use of the aesthetic perception approach.
- Further training and program development should be undertaken with project participants to move them beyond the initial focus on sensory properties.
- Implementation phases of a project should include an emphasis on assessment techniques to be used by participants as a way of providing evidence of children's growth.

Summary of Results: Objective Two - To conduct five inservice workshops to extend aesthetic education development.

Assessment records, staff assessment of workshops and attendance records indicate the following:

Analysis of participants' assessment of and reaction to the workshops indicated that these were a valuable part of the implementation phase. The opportunity to discuss their developing understanding of aesthetic perception and their implementation with Dr. Broudy was the most valued part of the workshops. The participants also indicated that the sharing with others provided encouragement and new ideas that helped to extend their individual applications of the approach.

Staff assessment of workshop results indicated that these functioned as a kind of center of "hope" that helped participants carry out implementation in circumstances that were difficult at times.

Some participants reported difficulty in attending workshop sessions because they were busy meeting demands made by other curricular areas.

Conclusions: Objective Two

- Opportunities to meet during the year and participante in workshop activities provided encouragement and reinforcement for participants during implementation.
- Because the arts are often given relatively low priority in many schools and the circumstances where implementation was to take place were difficult, participants needed the support they received from each other.
- Institutional constraints and other variables beyond the project sometimes tended to impose limits on the extent of implementations.

Implications: Objective Two

- Implementation of aesthetic education programs should include regular meetings of the participants to ensure participant attendance for the exchange of ideas whenever possible. For example, schools and museums should be asked to release participants to attend all meetings.
- Provisions should be made for participants to discuss their implementation with project staff and they should be given ample opportunity to "show case" their efforts, receiving recognition for their work.
- Some provision should be made for an "ideas center," some place where there is an opportunity for the participants to experience the renewal and nope that seemed so important.
- During a long range implementation, some form of communication of shared ideas and suggestions among (for example a newsletter should be planned and made available.

AESTHETIC EYE PARTICIPANT PROFILE

A profile of project activities, and activity results summarized for each participant, was prepared as an aid to overall evaluation (see Appendix D. The profile includes:

Records of participation in various project activities.
Records of the development of curriculum plans.

Descriptions of collections of curriculum resources.
Records of visitations.
Records of peak experiences.
Records of participants volunteering to demonstrate application of project techniques.
Summaries of assessment results.
Summaries of unobtrusive measures.

The project staff used the profile in drawing overall conclusions and making recommendations for further development of the Aesthetic Eye Program in the Los Angeles County.

Summary of Results: Participant Profile

Review of the profile shows a range of involvement, results, and utilization which appears to have moved the participants from apparently simple fulfillment of requirements to a major commitment to aesthetic education.

The review also revealed little clustering of measures in a way that would allow for conclusions and implications by subgroups within the study i.e., classroom teachers and community agency people. There are no apparent results that can be used to describe subgroup differences.

A comparison was made of the Aesthetic Eye Inventory gain scores for each individual with a group mean by question to determine grouping or trends within the results:

Question #1 - Basis for justifying judgments about modes of art. Trends indicate generally weak development for both group and individuals.

Question #2 - Special characteristics of aesthetic experience. Tendency indicated strong development for both the group and individuals.

Question #3 - Importance of aesthetic education. Tendency indicated strong development for both group and individuals.

Question #4 - Terms used to describe works of art. Tendency for the total group was less positive than that for individuals.

Question #5 - Basis for justifying judgments. Comparisons reveal two groups, one showing improvement in justifying judgments while the second evidenced little change in gain scores. In neither group was there a majority within the group.

Question #6 - One word responses to a painting. Tendencies indicated some growth for individuals while the majority of the group did not make major gains.

Question #7 - One word responses to ethnic sculpture. Tendencies were strong indicating growth for both the group and individuals.

Question #8 - Comparison of two reproductions of paintings. Comparisons reveal two groups, one showing improvement making comparisons while the other evidenced little growth.

Question #9 - Reactions to photograph of architectural structure. Strongest tendency for growth for both individuals and the group in responding to an aesthetic image.

Question #10 - Selection of an image and reasons for choice. Tendency indicates strong development for both groups and individuals. In neither group was there a majority within the group.

Conclusions: Participant Profile

- Project participation and utilization appears to be positively related to variables of the degree of perceived need on the part of participants.
- There appears to be no correlation between project participation and the demographic variables used to establish subgroups of participants. The aesthetic perception approach appeared to be as useful for community agency personnel as for teachers.
- Understanding of project results will be most meaningful when presented in terms of individual accomplishment rather than as group data. For this reason, a summary statement for each participant has been added to the profile.
- Conclusions were drawn based on the comparison of individual gain scores with the group mean by question as follows:

  Question #1 - Basis for justifying judgments. Gains were made in the use of the aesthetic property systems. However, the inclusion of the perceptual focus with judgments was less in evidence.

  Question #2 - Special characteristics of aesthetic experience. Gains indicated that property systems will be used as a structure by participants as a way of describing aesthetic experience more objectively and specifically.

  Question #3 - Importance of aesthetic education. Gains indicated that participants acquired arguments in support of aesthetic education that were imbedded in the process of learning to use the aesthetic perception technique.

  Question #4 - Terms used to describe a work of art. School and community agency personnel can make significant increases in their aesthetic vocabulary through aesthetic perception training. However, results indicate that many participants started with little aesthetic vocabulary base and more training should be given.

  Question #5 - Basis for justifying judgments. The grouping of results reflects the differences in participant sophistication prior to the aesthetic eye experience.

  Question #6 - One word responses to a painting. Initial responses were largely historical and judgmental and, while there was a gain in number of responses, there was a more significant shift to the use of the property systems.

Question #7 - One word responses to ethnic sculpture. Gains indicate a general increase in ability to respond to a work of art using an aesthetic properties approach. The focus was given to sensory, formal, and technical properties as part of the shift away from historical, judgmental, and expressive responses.

Question #8 - Comparison of two reproductions of paintings. Results falling into two groups. Reflects the difference in participant sophistication prior to the aesthetic eye experience. It appeared that some participants were to apply their newly acquired skills more readily than others.

Question #9 - Reactions to photograph of architectural structure. Responses showed an increase in the technical properties, subject matter, and expressive properties above those in other questions. The inclusion of an image of a familiar environmental structure evoked the use of the widest range of categories. The use of the term reaction seemed to aid in eliciting this wide range.

Question #10 - Selection of an image and reasons for choice. Gains indicated that participants were able to present their statements of position with greater objectivity and specificity in discussing works of art.

Implications: Participant Profile

° Participants should be informed of and understand the purposes of aesthetic education in ways that would ensure their perception of direct need for project participation whenever possible.

° Non-school personnel should be included in project participation because both school and non-school participants benefit and bring added richness to one another.

° Inferences can be made from the comparison of individual gain scores with the group mean by question as follows:

Question #1 - Basis for justifying judgments about modes of art. As participants move from a perceptual focus to one of judgment, some initial sophistication in the use of the aesthetic perception technique is required that will be applied within a larger process of developed aesthetic response.

Question #2 - Special characteristics of aesthetic experience. Results suggest that school and community agency personnel can learn to approach aesthetic experience with more objectivity and with greater specificity after aesthetic perception training.

Question #3 - Importance of aesthetic education. When school and community agency personnel learn the aesthetic perception approach within a larger aesthetic education context, they can learn to support aesthetic education with objective arguments.

Question #4 - Terms used to describe works of art. Participants as individuals acquired more aesthetic vocabulary. However, the average number of terms used before the training was quite small. While significant gains were made, the average number of terms remained relatively small in comparison to the largest individual improvements.

Question #5 - Basis for justifying judgments. Provisions should be made for individual differences in level of sophistication in the acquisition of the aesthetic perception technique.

Question #6 - One word responses to a painting. School and community agency people can learn to extend their responses beyond the usual historical response to emphasize aesthetic properties.

Question #7 - One word responses to ethnic sculpture. As participants are trained to use an aesthetic properties approach, they should learn to work with these in relation to the full range of property systems.

Question #8 - Comparison of two reproductions of paintings. As participants acquire the aesthetic perception technique, every opportunity should be used to have them practice applications in a variety of situations.

Question #9 - Reaction to photograph of architectural structure. As school and community agency personnel are taught to use the aesthetic perception technique, practice should include in the range of images, familiar environmental structures (e.g., bridges, buildings, freeway overpasses). Questions which ask for responses to works of art should be phrased in terms of "reactions" as well as "responses" to works.

Question #10 - Selection of an image and reasons for choice. As school and community agency personnel learn the aesthetic perception approach, they should be given practice in making choices and defending them.

° Evaluation of similar projects in the immediate future appears to require individual rather than group findings. Further study should be made to find those dimensions that will allow for more general conclusions based upon group data.